

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,292, Vol. 50.

July 31, 1880.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE CANDAHAR DISASTER.

BEFORE the arrival of the message which was received at the India Office on Wednesday it had become evident that a struggle for the possession of Candahar and the neighbouring province was impending. More than a week ago a part of the WALI's troops deserted their standard to join the force which has been slowly advancing under AYUB KHAN from Herat. The mutineers were pursued and dispersed by a detachment of General BURROWS's force, and it was thought that many of the survivors would take the opportunity of returning to their homes. The latest movements of the English General are still imperfectly known; but, whether he was surprised or overpowered, with full notice of the strength of the enemy, he can scarcely be acquitted of want of skill, unless indeed his troops were seized with a panic, or unless the native cavalry mutinied in the presence of the enemy. The citadel of Candahar into which General PRIMROSE has since retreated ought to be tenable for a time against any native army. Too little attention has been paid by English commentators on Afghan affairs to the movements of AYUB and the regiments which followed him from Herat. The boldness of the enterprise proved the confidence of the leader, or perhaps of the military chiefs around him, in the strength and discipline of the force which was supposed to have been occupied with domestic quarrels. The troops from Cabul and the indigenous soldiery of Herat have in some way patched up their feud; and they have found means of subsistence during their long march on Candahar. They probably assured themselves of support from the country they invaded; and it is not unlikely that by this time they may have been reinforced by the whole of the WALI's troops.

Twice within a year and a half English troops have suffered serious defeats for which there had been no precedent since the destruction of ELPHINSTONE's army in the first retreat from Cabul. The last misfortune recalls the memory of Isandlana; and its effects are likely to be more serious. The English advance into Zululand was then delayed for several weeks; but the enemy made no attempt to follow up the victory, and ultimate success was from the first absolutely certain. The calamity which has now occurred may probably have wide political consequences, including the necessity of retrieving at any cost the military reputation which has been grievously compromised. The Indian Government would probably have determined on the evacuation of Candahar, though, as Lord HARTINGTON said on Tuesday, the disposal of the city and territory formed no part of the arrangement with ABDURRAHMAN. Retirement will now be more difficult, if indeed Candahar is still in English possession; and it is possible that AYUB may become a formidable competitor for the throne of Cabul. An Ameer who is forced to dispense with the possession of Herat and Candahar can scarcely hope to be permanently acknowledged as a national ruler. At present it is impossible to calculate all the political results which may follow from the defeat of General BURROWS. The only definite advantage which had been secured in a long war or succession of wars was the establishment of a belief in English military superiority, which had been rudely disturbed by the events of the last Afghan war, including the immediate retreat of the invading army after the second occupation of Cabul. General ROBERTS and General

STEWART had repeatedly defeated superior Afghan forces, and it was believed on both sides that any further contest would have a similar issue. The recent disaster will destroy for the time the wholesome impression which had been produced. The success of an Afghan force will be reported with exaggeration throughout the country, and it is even possible that Sir DONALD STEWART may be compelled to fight once more for the possession of Cabul. Even if ABDURRAHMAN and his supporters have the good sense to abide by the settlement which has lately been effected, his own position will be seriously affected by the success of his kinsman and rival.

The arrival of ABDURRAHMAN in Turkestan was certainly not intended by his Russian patrons to provide a comparatively tolerable solution for the perplexities of English policy; but, on the whole, Lord LYTON seems to have been well advised in profiting by an unexpected opportunity. The son of the eldest son of DOST MAHOMED had as plausible a hereditary claim to the succession as any other member of the BARUKZYE family; and ABDURRAHMAN had, before the establishment of SHERE ALI's power, fought and negotiated with ability and vigour. It is probable that, during his long residence in Russian territory, he may have increased his political knowledge; and it appears that he has not, like many Asiatic princes in similar circumstances, sunk into habits of dissipation. If late reports can be trusted, ABDURRAHMAN is temperate in his habits, and he transacts business in person, instead of relying on Ministers and favourites. It would be rash to rely on his gratitude for offers which, as he well knows, are not wholly disinterested; but his friendship may perhaps be earned by liberal treatment, and especially by impressing him with the just conviction that he has more to hope from the Government of India than from any other ally. There has been, as Lord HARTINGTON states, some difference of opinion among Lord RIPON's advisers on the expediency of recognizing ABDURRAHMAN as Ameer; but the English Government is satisfied with the final decision of the VICEROY, and probably the objections to any rival candidate might have been equally strong, and they would have been of the same nature.

Lord HARTINGTON judged rightly in speaking, even before the news of the disaster had arrived, of the Afghan settlement as provisional and incomplete. The later policy of Lord LYTON continued by Lord RIPON seems to have been judicious; but the embarrassments which still remain illustrate the risk of the original enterprise. The attack on Ali Musjid, which caused the flight of SHERE ALI from his capital, began a period of uncertainty, and even of anarchy, which may yet last for an indefinite time. Other events have happened in a sequence which could probably not have been interrupted. The Indian Government could not be blamed for recognizing the competence of YAKOOB to represent the nation and the dynasty in concluding the Treaty of Gundamak. The policy of insisting on the reception of an English Envoy at Cabul was more disputable; but there can be little doubt that in any circumstances the treaty would have been broken. The advance on Cabul after the murder of CAVAGNARI was inevitable; and there has since been no convenient opportunity of retiring from Afghanistan. The representative of the VICEROY had to find some ruler with whom it was possible to treat; and YAKOOB had unfortunately rendered his restoration to power impossible. The chieftains who had his young son under their con-

trol possessed neither the rank nor the influence which could entitle them to claim supremacy in his name. It may be added that hostile attempts were incessantly renewed; and that until lately the fortress of Ghuznee was occupied by insurgents or enemies. A negotiation with a military adventurer such as MOHAMED JAN, and a consequent retreat from the country, would have been not unreasonably regarded by the Afghans as an acknowledgment of defeat. Unfortunately it is but too probable that the disaster at Candahar will cause a renewal of hostilities in all parts of Afghanistan. The deepest anxiety will be felt until it is known whether General PHAYRE has been able to relieve General BURROWS and the garrison. The exaggerated account which was first sent by General PRIMROSE has been corrected; but enough remains to make political as well as military calculations for the present worthless. If AYUB KHAN succeeds in improving his victory, he will perhaps be able to establish his power in Cabul as well as in Herat and Candahar; but the substitution of one candidate for another would be a matter of trifling importance in comparison with the graver consequences of the overthrow of English influence in Afghanistan. In the more probable event of the final defeat of AYUB, the chief competitor with ABDURRAHMAN will be no longer formidable.

THE HARES AND RABBITS BILL.

THE first act of the Government play, *The School for Communists*, having as far as the House of Commons is concerned, had the curtain dropped upon it, the curtain as naturally rose again last Thursday upon the second act. There was indeed a time when the Hares and Rabbits Bill was designed by the playwright to fill the whole of the drama for the period of the present Session. But Mr. FORSTER'S afterthought, assisted by Mr. PARNELL and Mr. O'CONNOR POWER, took sudden shape in the Compensation for Disturbance (Ireland) Bill, and the HOME SECRETARY and his hares and rabbits had to lurk in the background. There they have lurked for nearly two months, while the intrusive measure has tested the fidelity of Mr. GLADSTONE'S carpet-baggers. The elect of the Hundreds will not have so severe a strain put on them by the Hares and Rabbits Bill. For, while the utter un-equity—iniquity is perhaps rather a question-begging, though not an inappropriate, term—of the Irish Bill has startled even those who do not own land, the Hares and Rabbits proposal has a certain specious air of kinship with the anti-Game-law measure which has always formed part of the Radical platform, and appeals to the healthy hatred of those who are *satis beati ruris honoribus*, which Radical townsmen always feel. On the other hand, it is by no means certain that some at least of those Liberal land-owners who, with a very liberal interpretation of ancient precepts, have borne the spoiling of other people's goods quietly, seeing that they themselves have no Irish property, may not be a little touchy now that the question is one affecting themselves directly, and in a quarter where they feel quite as keenly as the most benighted of their Tory neighbours. If, therefore, the problem were merely one dealing with the limits of subserviency of a Radical majority, the present measure would supply an interesting variation to the previous instance of the Irish Compensation Bill. But, as it happens, its interest is by no means limited to this.

During its long period of occultation the Bill has been, as was natural, less attended to than more prominent measures; but it has nevertheless served as an occasion for eliciting from all sorts of people some very curious expressions of opinion. The tenant-farmers as a rule appear, as was to be expected, to be not dissatisfied with it; and the owners of land, as was also to be expected, to be very much dissatisfied. The excellent reason which the latter have for this dissatisfaction was manifested in a dramatic fashion by an announcement made immediately after the introduction of the Bill. It was said that Mr. CHAPLIN had disposed of his shooting rights in Lincolnshire to his tenants at the rate of a shilling an acre, the transaction increasing his rents by something over a thousand a year. We presume that the Bill, if carried in its entirety, would make such bargains void in future, or would at least deprive the landlord of the power of enforcing them, and a calculation of the acreage of England, apart from moors and wastes, will show that by this Bill a good many millions annually are

forcibly taken out of the pockets of one class and put into the pockets of another. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that all sorts of arguments have been used against the measure, arguments which perhaps culminated in Lord STAMFORD'S fear that the workers in the mining districts would lose their favourite Sunday dinner in consequence of the certain extinction of the race of rabbits, and in the still more pathetic plea put forward elsewhere as to the Sunday, and indeed weekday, dinner of foxes. With respect to this argument, it will probably strike not a few persons that foxes are capable of taking care of themselves, and are not at all unlikely to exact poetical justice from the tenant-farmer by levying double taxes on his poultry yard. A chicken is, after all, either for man or fox not a bad substitute for a rabbit. Politically the proposal has also acted in a curious way. During the former discussion of the Bill member after member of the purest Liberal faith rose to give notice of antagonistic motions and amendments, and it was perfectly obvious that, both from personal feelings and from objections to the interference with public contract which the Bill implies, they would certainly not be without followers on their own side of the House. So threatening indeed was the prospect that it seemed at one time as if the Government would not be averse to availing themselves of some pretext for dropping the measure or letting it be stranded on one of the numerous Parliamentary shoals which lie about for all measures half-heartedly or unskillfully piloted. Then a strange rumour got abroad to the effect that, while Liberals were thus mutinying, not a few Conservative county members had determined to support the Bill, evidently as a sop to their constituents, and to deter them from repeating or exaggerating the defection which returned in April so many Liberals for unhoped-for seats. So that, on the whole, the chances of the measure when it at last came on for serious discussion were of a highly speculative kind. Even the tenant-farmers are supposed to regard it, as Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE says they regard the commutation of the Malt-tax, as an attention rather than a substantial benefit, and the different circumstances of different parts of the country gave ample occasion for special and local objections.

When the debate actually came on, this complication of interests and arguments was fully represented. Not a little time indeed was uselessly taken up on Thursday night because Mr. GLADSTONE, in one of the incomprehensible fits of obstinacy which not unfrequently come upon him, refused for something more than an hour the very reasonable demand for an adjournment. The reasonableness of that demand is evident from the facts already mentioned. When there is so great a divergence of opinion, and when there are so many different interests to be represented, it is especially desirable that the fullest opportunity of expressing them should be given. And, as a matter of fact, the speeches on Thursday were almost all of a more or less instructive kind, as exhibiting fresh sides of a many-sided question. No one contended that hares and rabbits were not sometimes by accident, sometimes by the injudicious conduct of individuals, capable of becoming serious nuisances. But at this point agreement may be said to have ceased, and it is somewhat remarkable that the most decided support given to the HOME SECRETARY'S Bill came from a political opponent, Mr. RODWELL, who was apparently guided by the wishes of the tenant-farmers rather than by any affection for the measure itself. Now the wishes of the tenant-farmers, like the wishes of all other classes, no doubt deserve respectful consideration; but it does not follow that those wishes, even if they were much more clearly expressed than they have been, are a sufficient basis for legislation, especially for legislation of so singular a kind. No speaker on Thursday succeeded in making out anything like parallel or precedent for this remarkable interference with freedom of contract, and for the still more remarkable creation of inalienable rights. It was very well pointed out that all similar interferences of moment which the Legislature has made have been either in favour of those who are practically unable to help themselves, or else have been directed immediately to the saving of human life. The interference proposed by the Hares and Rabbits Bill cannot by any ingenuity be brought under either category; and it is exposed to a number of weighty objections peculiar to itself. It not only does not touch the principle of the Game-laws, but it may be said to create a new vested interest in those laws, by virtue of the inalienable right lodged in the sacred person of the

occupier. Hence it cannot be logically supported by Mr. PETER TAYLOR's followers. It does nothing whatever for that curious pet of certain philanthropists, the sporting labourer. Hence it ought to be vetoed by the disciples of Mr. ARCH. It establishes a system of concurrent, not to say clashing, rights which must infallibly create bad blood between landlord and tenant. It initiates in favour of the latter the mischievous theory of the occupier's property in his holding, which is already bearing fruit for all men to see and taste in Ireland. If its operation might in some cases prevent over-preserving and wanton slaughter, it would in a very much larger number of cases interfere with not the least deserving class of sportsmen—those who, unable to spend their whole time in the country, seek rest and relaxation in the renting of shooting rights. It tends, in the opinion of many of the very best judges, to the extirpation of hares and rabbits altogether; and though Mr. A. ELLIOT is reported to have said that the people of England could get on very well without hares and rabbits, this argument is not to be too implicitly accepted. The people of England could, it may be suggested, get on very well without Mr. A. ELLIOT, yet no one would for this reason advocate the forcible extinction of a gentleman who is doubtless an ornament to society and to Parliament. In short, it may be doubted whether a measure has ever been introduced more liable to objection from this side and from that than the present Bill. To all such objections ample consideration is due, and therefore Mr. GLADSTONE's attempt to force a division by his now usual method of threatening the House was as indefensible as it was indecent.

TURKEY.

NO change has taken place in Eastern affairs, except that the prospect of a naval expedition is becoming more definite. It is now stated that each of the Great Powers will contribute two vessels to the formation of a squadron, which is probably to be commanded by Admiral SEYMOUR. The purpose of the operation is still mysterious. As it is expressly stated that no troops are to be embarked, it seems at first sight to follow that the Turks and Albanians will not be seriously molested if they decline to obey the commands of the European Governments. It is highly improbable that the combined fleet will engage in the doubtful enterprise of forcing the passage of the Dardanelles, where the defences have been recently repaired and strengthened. The Turkish fleet will not be rash enough to incur certain defeat by encountering the combined fleet. The Commander-in-Chief, Admiral HOBART, must of course resign his commission as soon as his own country is at war with Turkey. It is announced that the first demand to be enforced will be the surrender to Montenegro of the territory which was stipulated in the compromise negotiated by Count CORTI. The SULTAN, if he declines to yield, will urge in vain the difficulty of ensuring the obedience of the Albanians, who are, with good reason, believed to be executing his commands or wishes. It is thought that the appearance of the allied fleet on the Albanian coast will convince the tribes as well as the Turkish Government that the Powers are at last in earnest. The malcontents may perhaps not be aware that, in default of troops to be landed, the ships are powerless to molest them except within reach of their guns. Their more prudent leaders may also infer from the so-called demonstration the probability that further measures will be taken if compliance is obstinately refused. The Montenegrins have already received a pecuniary subsidy from Russia, and probably they are assisted by Russian officers. It is not known that similar assistance has been given or promised by any Power to Greece; but the Greeks are continuing their armaments. It may be assumed that they will not provoke certain defeat by entering the disputed territory on the Eastern side. The Albanians would in their own country probably be more than a match for any Greek invading force; and the Turkish army would, if its aid were required, easily crush a weak and undisciplined enemy. There might perhaps be a better chance of success in Thessaly, where nearly the whole population is Greek in race and language; but, if the Turks can spare any considerable force to defend the province, they will probably not be attacked.

The only reason for hoping that the SULTAN will yield consists in the probable conclusion that the European Powers cannot have entered into a formal compact to make

themselves ridiculous. The Ministers of the different States must know as well as their irresponsible critics that a naval force which will neither engage in hostilities by sea nor convey troops to act on land would fail to frighten adversaries much more timid than the Turks. It may therefore be taken for granted either that they have cause to rely on the eventual pliability of the SULTAN, or that they are prepared to employ more stringent methods of compelling submission. If the temporary league or coalition which has been formed were directed by Mr. GLADSTONE, it might perhaps share his favourite illusion that the Porte will never resist the verbal dictation of Europe. He is probably justified in the belief that a common declaration of war, or even the exaction of some material guarantee, would produce the desired effect; but Mr. GLADSTONE only shares in the control of English policy; and probably the prudence and experience of Lord GRANVILLE may be used to guard him from the consequences of his own imperfect knowledge and sentimental precipitancy. The other Powers, with the exception of Russia, are not enthusiastic partisans of Montenegro, and none of them appear to meditate any sacrifices for the sake of Greece. The French Government indeed has sometimes professed sympathy with the Greek cause; but its organs consistently protest against any participation in measures which might involve the country in an unprofitable war. The alliance of Germany with Austria, which seems every day to become closer, renders hostile operations against Turkey on the part of either Power in the highest degree improbable. Italy will not act alone; but, if the occasion arises, it will probably co-operate with Russia. The well-known saying that it is necessary to understand a paradox before regarding it as a simple blunder applies to Governments as well as to private persons. The able newspaper Correspondents who accumulate authorities to prove that there is no real union among the Powers fail to account for the naval demonstration which can only be explained by their political concert. The unanimity of the Plenipotentiaries at the late Berlin Conference suggests the same obvious inference. The zeal of the English Government may perhaps be intelligible; but the French, the German, and the Austrian Governments would scarcely have addressed a peremptory demand to the Porte if they had been prepared to acquiesce in an obstinate refusal. Still less would they have allowed their flags to be used for the purpose of empty menace.

The despatch of a combined fleet to the eastern shores of the Adriatic will, in the first instance, be so conducted as not to amount to an act of war; but, if the first movement proves to be useless, it will be necessary for some at least of the Powers to proceed to more practical measures. By common consent Continental politicians award to England the duty of enforcing the decisions of the Conference. Of Russia, which, at least in the case of Montenegro, is much more likely to interfere, it is not deemed expedient to speak so openly. Some of the English journalists who are especially devoted to Mr. GLADSTONE have urged him to the discharge of a supposed duty which may perhaps be honourable and which is certainly perilous. Sir WILFRID LAWSON in the debate on Armenia frankly expressed the surprise which many of Mr. GLADSTONE's followers would feel if it appeared that his too fervid sympathies had induced him to engage in an unprovoked and unnecessary war. They would perhaps not share the opinion which was hastily expressed by Sir WILFRID LAWSON that the objects of Mr. GLADSTONE's Quixotic benevolence were the greatest scoundrels on the face of the earth; but they would narrowly scrutinize the claims of the Greeks to territorial aggrandizement, obtained by the sacrifice of English money and English life. In some other cases the present Government may plausibly contend that its dangers and misfortunes are the inevitable consequence of the mistakes of the former Ministry; but a war with Turkey could only begin with a deliberate reversal of Lord BEACONSFIELD's policy. He and Lord SALISBURY, though they have often been blamed for not showing sufficient energy in asserting the claims of Greece, will probably receive credit for not having engaged in even a naval demonstration against Turkey. A stronger feeling of indignation against their successors would be aroused if they were suspected of a separate and offensive alliance with Russia. A Greek and Montenegrin war against Turkey, coinciding with a Bulgarian insurrection, would be universally unpopular in England,

except among Mr. GLADSTONE's extreme and unqualified adherents. His own devotion to peace is so well known that he will probably shrink at the last moment from the logical consequence of his naval demonstration. It is on every ground desirable that the European concert should be maintained as long as possible. It would have had a better chance of permanence if Mr. GLADSTONE had not wantonly irritated Austria, and consequently incurred the risk of differences with Germany. The rude phrase of "Hands off" was, as Mr. GLADSTONE's apologists strenuously contended, more deliberately repeated in his notorious letter to Count KAROLYI. He then professed to be satisfied with the assurance that Austria entertained no ambitious designs of extending her dominions towards the Ægean. It is not impossible that the scheme to which he referred may form a part of Prince BISMARCK's Eastern policy. It may be repeated that the principal ground for confidence in the United Powers is founded on the apparent inefficiency of a measure which therefore may have some purpose or excuse not visible on the surface of things.

THE IRISH DISTURBANCE BILL.

THE objections to the Irish Disturbance Bill have lost none of their force; and the repugnance with which it is regarded has rather increased than diminished; but in the later debates the opponents have found that resistance was useless. The inchoate secession was not likely to be completed on the first divergence of opinion and principle; but the Whig members who have refused to support the Bill have sufficiently shown to the Government the necessity of choosing between extreme and moderate partisans. They cannot have expected that the Bill would be abandoned in deference to their scruples; but their silent or open protest may exercise a possible influence on Mr. GLADSTONE's future policy. In the present instance his conduct has been characterized by rashness and haste rather than by deliberate preference of revolutionary doctrines. It is impossible that Mr. FORSTER can have consciously introduced the most dangerous of modern legislative measures in the form of a clause suddenly inserted into a Bill which was otherwise unopposed. The repeated changes which have been proposed and withdrawn with little final change in the structure of the Bill afford an additional proof of the carelessness with which it was originally promoted. Mr. GLADSTONE, who deserves credit for the command of temper he has displayed during the Session, has taken the most judicious course for the purpose of conciliating opposition by consistent assertions of the comparative unimportance of a Bill narrowly limited in time and not extending over more than half Ireland. He has perhaps been startled and annoyed by the praise which he has received from partisans less reticent than himself. Mr. RYLANDS approved of the measure, not because it is moderate and comparatively harmless, but as a precedent for the transfer of proprietary rights from the landlord to the tenant, and for other forms of future spoliation of the same unfortunate class. Colonel KINGSCOTE and other members naturally inquired whether the Government concurred in the opinion of its too candid adherent. The question was justified by more than one imprudent phrase of Mr. FORSTER's, though he declined responsibility for the extravagances of Mr. RYLANDS. The dullest and most commonplace intellects are sometimes the most accurate interpreters of ambiguous policy. They at once form the conclusion that an obvious violation of justice is not destined to be a trivial or a solitary anomaly.

More sagacious apologists, though they may probably agree with Mr. RYLANDS, have taken a hint from the ostentatious moderation of Mr. GLADSTONE. The same writer who lately declared that a plutocratic Assembly must be reformed if democratic measures were to be passed has of late endeavoured to reclaim frightened seceders by reminding them that Lord HARTINGTON, Lord KIMBERLEY, and Lord SPENCER are still members of the Government. A fortnight ago the new Parliament was said to have commenced a new era; but it now seems that the Irish Disturbance Bill is an ordinary administrative proceeding rather than a measure which establishes new principles of legislation. Sir CHARLES TREVELYAN, who justly classes the Disturbance Bill with the Hares and Rabbits Bill as an attack on the principle of property in

land, is mildly assured that Mr. FORSTER only guards against the wrongs which might be committed by a small minority of arbitrary landlords. It might be said in answer that it could not be right to disturb the foundations of property for the purpose of correcting a few isolated cases of hardship. The Ministers who have almost alone taken part in the conduct of the measure have never taken the trouble to ascertain or to state the magnitude of the alleged evil for which they provide a violent remedy. The outrageous statistics which were exploded by Lord GEORGE HAMILTON have neither been defended nor disclaimed; and perhaps Mr. FORSTER's 3,400 policemen may still be crossing and recrossing the stage of his imagination. The Irish ATTORNEY-GENERAL calmly accepted Mr. GIBSON's statement that nearly all the cruel and evicting landlords had allowed their tenants to run into arrear for two years' rent. They are to be rewarded by a further postponement for two or three years of payment of their undisputed claims.

The principal speeches in the debate on the third reading were those of Mr. FORSTER and Mr. GLADSTONE for the Bill, and of Mr. TOTTENHAM and Mr. CLARKE against it. Mr. TOTTENHAM's exposure of the statistical blunders of the Government were not less complete than Lord GEORGE HAMILTON's; and Mr. CLARKE analysed with considerable success some of the fallacious figures which have furnished rather an apology than a motive for the Bill. He also answered with much force Mr. FORSTER's boast that the Bill, as it leaves the House of Commons, differs but little from the original draft. The Government in various stages of the discussion consented to more than one mitigation of the injustice inflicted on landlords; but they were forced by Mr. PARNELL and his followers both to abandon the Irish ATTORNEY-GENERAL's amendment, and to raise the limit of suspension of rent from 30*l.* to 45*l.* In answer to Mr. TOTTENHAM, who had proved that the scheduled districts were not even approximately coincident with the area subject to distress, Mr. GLADSTONE boldly asserted that the primary object of the Bill was not to relieve distress, but to prevent anarchy, which he described as approaching within a measurable distance of civil war. He forgot that the measure which has caused so much alarm was originally introduced as a clause in the Bill for the relief of distress. Mr. FORSTER may be acquitted of any intention to smuggle an important enactment through the House; but he evidently believed at the time that little opposition would be offered to the suspension of rents if it was proposed with direct and exclusive reference to the failure of recent harvests. Mr. GLADSTONE is not justified in shifting the responsibility from himself to the Opposition, or in declaring that the rejection of the Bill will excite grave discontent in Ireland by reason of hopes which correspond to the fears of those who deprecate the measure. It may be well to take note of Mr. GLADSTONE's repeated statements that the Bill has been so framed as to afford no precedent for future legislation. No political innovation ends with itself; and a temporary disturbance of the rights of landlords evidently impairs the security of property. There is too much reason to fear that Mr. GLADSTONE may hereafter discover in the present Bill the germs of more comprehensive legislation. On a balance of evils it may be doubtful whether the House of Lords will be well advised in rejecting the Bill. The danger which may result from an adverse decision must be exclusively attributed to the authors of the Bill.

Except in the speeches of Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. FORSTER, there is a general consent of opinion among friends and enemies as to the gravity of the measure. Sir JOHN RAMSDEN expressed the reluctance of moderate Liberals to abandon their leader, and the urgency of the reasons which induced them to protest against spoliation. Mr. SHAW-LEFEVRE, the only member of the Government except the Irish SECRETARY and the PRIME MINISTER who took part in the final debate, could not, even at the risk of injury to the cause which he defended, refrain from propounding the revolutionary theory that the right to rent ought to be dependent on the goodness of crops. In France or in Germany, as he asserted, a bad harvest exempted the tenant from payment of rent; and he inferred that the same immunity ought to extend to Ireland and to England. Although the exact operation of the custom of which Mr. LEFEVRE spoke has been disputed, that custom evidently regulates the relation of landlord and tenant, and constitutes the contract between them.

Even a modern theorist on land will scarcely assert that the bargain between the English landowner and the tenant farmer is dependent on the contingency of the seasons; but the argument is significant, as it implies Mr. LEFÈVRE's well-founded belief that the Disturbance Bill is an infringement of the rights of property. The Irish agitators on their part, and the advocates of extreme radicalism in the press, are under no illusion as to the importance of the precedent which has been established. The malcontent Whigs are openly warned that they will be thrust aside if they venture to resist the current of change. The number of seceders would have been largely increased if all Liberal members had dared to obey their convictions. There can be no doubt that the Clubs or Liberal Associations which are now established as permanent institutions have been set in motion by the central managers for the purpose of warning Liberal members of the danger of conscientious scruples. For the time the whole machinery is worked for the benefit of Mr. GLADSTONE, though he may perhaps himself take no direct part in the interference with the freedom of Parliament. That a majority of 170 should have been reduced to about a third of its full strength is creditable to the Liberal opponents of the Bill and to those who abstained from voting. The House of Lords would be justified in throwing on the Ministers the exclusive responsibility of an iniquitous measure. It is not a little remarkable that a summons to the Conservative peers has been issued with a list of names, headed by the Whig Duke of SOMERSET, which does not contain the name of a single Conservative leader. There can be little doubt that the Bill will be rejected by an overwhelming majority; but it would seem that Lord BEACONSFIELD judiciously leaves the conduct of the Opposition to Liberal or independent peers.

BELGIUM.

WHILE France has been celebrating the taking of the Bastille, Belgium has been celebrating its jubilee. Belgium has been an independent and a constitutional kingdom for fifty years, and in these days of change any institution which has lasted for fifty years naturally pauses to ponder on the mystery of its existence, and invites an admiring world to take notice that it has endured so long and still endures. No one who is thus invited to turn his eyes to Belgium and obeys the invitation can deny that Belgium is a most thriving little country, carrying on its affairs in a way creditable to itself and satisfactory to its neighbours, and marked by conspicuous signs of content, energy, and comfort. It has, too, everything a constitutional country ought to have. It has an excellent and popular sovereign, who in any rank of life would be noted for his varied information, his unaffected interest in all the larger social questions of the day, and his frankness and courtesy in the interchange of ideas and knowledge. The alliances of his House with the BOURBONS and the HAPSBURGERS give him an eminence above his rank in the list of European sovereigns, and the memory of his father still survives to invest him with something of the respect long paid to a monarch of singular sagacity and almost unrivalled experience. There is a Senate which, although elected, has some kind of dignity, and which, if it does little else, at least escapes criticism. There is a Chamber, which is the arena of constant Parliamentary fights, carried on in the most approved Parliamentary manner, and in which every vote is of importance, as government is carried on with the smallest conceivable majority. The population steadily increases, and now probably does not fall below five and a half millions. It is a familiar fact that Belgium is more densely populated than any European country; and, if it is a source of happiness that a dense population should be largely composed of landowners, Belgium possesses this advantage in a very remarkable degree. The whole number of proprietors, or, as it would probably be more accurate to say, of properties, is given at more than 1,300,000. Thus, speaking roughly, the number of properties is to the population as one to four, while in France it is one to six, and in the Belgian province of Luxemburg it is said that the proportion of properties to population reaches the astonishing figure of 48 per cent. The revenue—which balances, or perhaps falls slightly short of, the expenditure—amounts to 11 millions sterling a year, and may thus be taken at 2*l.* per head. It appears, if the statistics of different

countries are examined, that countries which can just scrape along, like Portugal and Greece, pay about 1*l.* a head; and the nearer a country gets to 2*l.* a head the nearer it approaches to the standard of acknowledged prosperity. Belgium, too, has an army which might contribute to the maintenance of its neutrality in times of danger, but which is not at all disproportioned to its resources, as it consists, or is intended to consist, of 40,000 men in peace and 100,000 in war. It may be added that, if Belgium is not the only country where the State owns some of the chief railways, it is the only country where the ownership of railways has proved a source of great and abiding profit to the State. It is fortunate, too, in having large and rich coalfields in proximity to populous towns, and there is perhaps no country in Europe which in this respect so nearly rivals England.

There can be no doubt that in a large degree it is to its material prosperity that Belgium owes its continuance for fifty years as a constitutional kingdom. Material prosperity always contributes to the continuance of any Government that is established. A prosperous despotism or a prosperous Republic is much more likely to last than a despotism or Republic that is poor or struggling. And it must be remembered that constitutionalism has not so much created as inherited the wealth of Belgium. All the dense population, all the rich soil, all the industrial enterprise of Belgium did not spring into existence when the first LEOPOLD was made king. Belgium was rich centuries ago, while England was still poor. Any Government that starts in a country like Belgium start with enormous advantages. It must not dry up sources of prosperity; but, if it avoids this, it is to have prosperity on its side. But while "fant constitutionalism of Belgium had this prosperity working in its favour, it had troubles in its path, either of which, as experience shown, might easily have been fatal to any constitutional Government. In the first place, Belgium is inhabited by two distinct populations, and these populations are not only of different origin, but are cut off from each other by the use of two distinct languages. There are a little less than two and a half millions of the population who speak French, and a little more than two and a half millions who speak Flemish, and out of all these millions there are only 340,000 who speak both Flemish and French. Theoretically, it might have been anticipated that the difficulty of welding two halves of a population thus divided into a country of free government would have been almost insuperable. Practically, whatever the difficulty may have been, the Belgians have surmounted it. The other obstacle to constitutional government in Belgium was even more serious. Nowhere is the great contest between the clerical and the anti-clerical parties waged with more bitterness, and nowhere do the opposing parties meet on such equal terms. There is always a clerical Ministry which its adversaries are just not able to overthrow, or an anti-clerical Ministry which would be very glad if the number of its majority equalled the number of our Scotch Conservative members. In Belgium, too, religious differences are a very serious matter. They colour every relation of private life and impair the peace and happiness of innumerable homes. If we can conceive ourselves going on for a dozen years with alternate periods in which there was a majority of three in favour of disestablishment and then a majority of two in favour of establishment, we may picture to our minds how hard it would be to carry on the Government at all. It must be allowed that constitutional Belgium, which has two such difficulties to encounter, not now and then but permanently, and which has for fifty years managed to encounter them successfully, deserves the praise of the friends of free government, and is amply entitled to enjoy its Jubilee, and ask others to share the satisfaction which it feels, and which it exhibits in a modest and rational way.

If it is asked how Belgium has overcome these difficulties, it is only due to the Belgians to give as the first answer that the Belgians are the Belgians, and that men of sense and good spirit can live together under conditions which would break up a society in which a different temper prevailed. Belgium has not only been fortunate in its sovereigns. It has also been fortunate in its statesmen, and in the possession of a large number of shrewd, orderly, sensible men of every rank. But it is to be feared that not all the monarchs and statesmen and sensible individuals of whom it can boast could have saved Belgian

constitutionalism from a catastrophe long before this, had it not been for another advantage of which Belgium reaps the benefit. This advantage is, that Belgium is a little State. It has a somewhat artificial existence dependent on the guarantee and good opinion of the Great Powers, and especially of England. A little State which is in this position is on its good behaviour, and the easiest mode of doing what it is required to do is to stick to constitutional Government when it has got it. The Belgians are very much helped in overcoming their difficulties by the consciousness that if they did not overcome them there would be no Belgium with difficulties to overcome. A despotism or a Republic in Belgium would have many enemies in Europe, while a constitutional Government has nothing but friends. These friends may sometimes be rather lukewarm, but they cannot find in a constitutional Government anything on which to fasten as an excuse for open alienation. If we are to accept the taking of the Bastille as the true beginning of the French Republic, we may certainly select the Revolution of July as the beginning of constitutionalism on the Continent. It led to the independence of Belgium as a small constitutional State, and to the possibility of Lord PALMERSTON pursuing for years his special policy of introducing as much constitutionalism as he saw his way to infuse into every country at which he could get at conveniently. Little by little all the small States of Europe have become constitutional, with the exception of Switzerland, where an ancient and respected Republic rendered any change unnecessary. France tried constitutionalism and rejected it; and one main reason why it rejected it was that, being a great country, it felt itself as free to reject it as it had been to accept it. France is what France chooses to be. It takes the consequences of its choice, and without hesitation meets the world as a Republic or an Empire, or again as a Republic. But little States which to exist at all must avoid giving offence desire to be at once happy and unnoticed, and they have discovered that, if constitutionalism adds to their own happiness, it also has the excellent secondary effect of enabling them to escape the kind of notice that would be unpleasant to them. They thus enjoy all the good fortune that proverbially attaches to nations that have no history, and of this species of good fortune the Belgian Jubilee has been a very successful commemoration.

THE INDIAN FAMINE COMMISSION.

THE Report of the Indian Famine Commission loses something in interest by the fact that it is as yet incomplete. The questions into which the Commissioners were instructed to inquire were mainly two—the measures to be adopted when famine has actually arrived, and the expedients by which it is possible to make famines less severe or less frequent than they at present are. As yet we are only in possession of the first part of the Commissioners' Report—that which deals with the measures to be adopted in the actual presence of famine. It is evident, however, that our acceptance of their conclusions under this head may be greatly modified by the second part of their Report. If it should appear that the Commissioners have underrated the power of the State to avert famine, it will naturally follow that they have overrated the necessity for relieving famine. The conception of the State as a power protecting its subjects against starvation renders the conception of the State as a power relieving its subjects when starving superfluous. It is quite certain, of course, that the former function will never be so perfectly discharged as to leave no room for the latter. But it is difficult to give an opinion upon recommendations directed to the organization of State relief until something is known of the extent to which other measures may be expected to make relief unnecessary.

Taking this first part of the Report as complete in itself, it presents a useful survey of the several famines which have happened in India during the last century, and of the means adopted to deal with them. The last part is necessarily the shorter of the two. It was not until the famine in Orissa in 1866 that the Government admitted their obligation to prevent the people from starving; but the very fact that they were almost powerless to apply their doctrine in the actual circumstances of the province

brought the question prominently before the public, and greatly influenced the action of the officials seven years later. In 1873-4 the winter rice crop failed in Northern Bengal, and, in view of the scarcity which was expected to follow, the Government acted with extraordinary energy. The Estimates included an importation of 480,000 tons of rice, and "provided against every possible contingency." When the famine was over, it appeared that no lives had been lost, and even that 100,000 tons of rice remained unused. The number of persons in need of relief had been designedly exaggerated in order that an ample margin of unexpended relief might be secured. This result, however, was obtained at a cost to the State of 6½ millions sterling. Three years later Southern India was visited by a yet worse calamity. The Government of India had been startled by the cost of famine relief in 1873-4, and had, as it thought, learnt from experience that it was possible to take too many precautions. During the Bengal famine the aim had been simply to save life; and every official knew that, provided this were done, the Government would not be extreme to count the money spent in doing it. During the famine in Southern India the aim was also to save life; but even in the statement of that aim there was a recognition that it might be beyond the power of the authorities to attain it. The Government, it was said, would spare no effort to save the population of the distressed districts from starvation, but they would not attempt to prevent suffering or to give general relief. Limitations of this kind naturally affect the action of the officials in doubtful cases. They know that the cost of saving life will be considered, and they consequently seek to reduce that cost to the lowest possible figure. There is no question of maximum estimates or of a margin of unused grain; the object is to calculate with the utmost nicety what will be wanted, and to have nothing left over when the wants come to an end. Notwithstanding these precautions, the cost of the relief operations in Southern India was eight millions; but, though it thus exceeded by a million and a half the cost of the Bengal famine, the result was far less satisfactory. Five millions of people died either from insufficient food or from the diseases commonly associated with insufficient food. In so far as this difference of result was owing to the difference in the measures adopted, the lavish method has an undoubted advantage over the parsimonious method. It may not be prudent for the State to attempt to prevent loss of life by famine; but if it does attempt it, it is well to make sure of success. It may admit of argument that the State might do more good to the people of India by refraining from imposing additional taxes than it can do by keeping the inhabitants of any particular province alive when they have outgrown their ordinary means of subsistence. But when once the State has presented itself to the people in the light of a special and over-ruling providence, it is important that it should proclaim itself to be an omnipotent providence. We do not know whether the Government gained anything in the opinion of its Indian subjects by the completeness with which it shielded them from the calamity of 1873-4; but it seems highly probable that it has lost something by its omission to shield them from the similar calamity of 1876-8. The five millions who died through the apathy or miscalculation or economy of the Indian Government are likely to have a more lasting place in Indian memories than the numbers—necessarily unknown—who were saved in 1873-4.

It does not appear from the Report what were the precise causes which led to the failure of the campaign against famine in Southern India as compared with the similar struggle three years earlier in Bengal. In theory, it seems, the principles upon which the Government had acted in the earlier instances were adopted in the later. In practice, however, "important modifications arose from the adoption "of the policy of leaving the supply of grain to the ordinary "operations of trade, and from the greater anxiety shown "to avoid profusion of expenditure and to secure the useful "application of labour." Unfortunately opinion differs as to the share which this change of view had in killing off five millions of people. It may be, of course, that the conditions of the famine in Madras and Bombay were so unlike those of the famine in Bengal that even an equally lavish expenditure would not have ensured the same immunity from death. But there is, at all events, a presumption in favour of the plan which has had no cases of starvation laid at its door over the plan which has not escaped such charges.

The regularity with which famines are now known to recur in various parts of India makes it incumbent upon the Government to have a perfectly understood code of regulations ready for application when the necessity arises. So long as each separate famine was supposed to be a calamity by itself, and not one that was certain to be followed by another, there was some excuse for the authorities if they were taken unawares. But with famines to be expected at average intervals of eleven or twelve years, and less severe scarcity two years out of every nine, there is no excuse for want of preparation. The Commissioners recommend that the Government of India should issue a set of rules embodying the main principles on which famine relief is to be administered, and that the local Governments should draw up famine codes applying these principles to the particular circumstances of each province. A draft of these rules and a model famine code has been drawn up by the Commissioners, and some points that are now obscure in their Report—especially the merits of the controversy which has arisen between Mr. CAIRD and Mr. SULLIVAN on the one side, and the remaining Commissioners on the other, upon the mode of providing relief—will probably become clear when this code is published. The Commissioners may justly be praised for the very thorough manner in which their work has hitherto been done, and their Report, when finished, will be a storehouse of information upon one of the most important and difficult subjects with which a Government can have to deal.

THE CHILTERN HUNDREDS.

SIR DRUMMOND WOLFF and his friends were quite entitled to bring to the notice of the House of Commons the many curious questions of Parliamentary law to which the peculiar position of Mr. DODSON gave rise. They were questions of a kind to which the attention of the House has been repeatedly called; and the whole system of Parliamentary procedure is at once so intricate and so exceptional that members who are acquainted with it, and can appreciate the importance of any variation in it, are fulfilling a public duty in taking cognizance of any novelty that may be introduced. In the case of Mr. DODSON two distinct questions were raised. He was elected for Chester at the general election, and a petition was presented against his return. Before the petition was heard he accepted office. A new writ was issued, and he was re-elected without a contest. All this was quite regular. The petitioners did not claim the seat. Had they done so, no new writ could have been issued. This was settled in the Athlone case, when the seat was claimed against Mr. KEOGH, the sitting member, and on his accepting the office of Solicitor-General for Ireland, the issue of a new writ was delayed until the petition had been heard and determined. That a new writ might issue if the seat was not claimed was decided by the SPEAKER in 1852; and, although the decision was subsequently criticized in Lord BURY's case, it has been practically adopted by the House as part of its standing procedure. Lord BURY's case, however, illustrated what may be termed the theoretical objections to the rule. Lord BURY was elected, a petition was presented, he accepted office, and was re-elected. But another petition was presented against his second return, and he was unseated. The reason why a candidate who has been guilty of bribery or corrupt practices through his agents is not allowed to represent the same constituency in the same Parliament must be that it is apprehended that he has got into bad hands, and that he and they cannot be trusted to work together innocently until a considerable interval of time has elapsed. In the same way, if a defeated candidate petitions, not claiming the seat, succeeds, and then stands, on a new writ being issued, for the same constituency, all his acts and those of his agents in the first contest may be brought up to throw light on their conduct in the second election, supposing he is elected and is petitioned against. What Parliament objects to is that a candidate should be in a position to repeat or to profit by the improper practices of his agents at a former election. The case of Lord BURY showed that such a thing might happen; and, if nothing was to be considered but the expediency of interposing the severest checks possible in the way of corrupt

practices, it might be held that no new writ should issue until a petition, whether claiming the seat or not, had been disposed of. It has been decided that the Chiltern Hundreds shall not be given to a member against whom a petition has been presented before it has been determined. But in the case of Ministers it has been thought to be inexpedient that they should be kept, possibly for months, out of Parliament, and as it would be easy to keep them out by presenting a petition for the mere purpose of excluding them for a term from the discharge of their Parliamentary duties, the custom has prevailed, entirely on the ground of convenience, of letting them at once have the benefit of the issue of a new writ.

When, as in the case of Mr. DODSON, a member has been elected, a petition has been presented, he has accepted office and has been re-elected, and then the petition has been decided against him, the ordinary course would be to issue a new writ. He has been rendered incapable of being elected or sitting for the same constituency. The House takes cognizance of this, and orders a new writ, and he is then capable of being elected for any other constituency, as he has plainly ceased to be a member of Parliament, and no disqualification attaches to him except that of being unable to sit for the same seat from which he has been ejected. But at Chester the judges have reported that corrupt practices extensively prevailed, and under such circumstances no new writ is allowed to be issued. Mr. DODSON could not get absolutely quit of Chester. By what tie he could be supposed to be still bound to Chester it is most difficult to see. He could not be taken to represent Chester; for he was clearly, under an Act of Parliament, a person incapable of being elected or sitting for Chester, and he would undoubtedly have been liable to a penalty if, after the decision of the election Judges, he had sat and voted in Parliament. All that can be said is that the usual step in formally terminating the connexion between the constituency and the member had not been taken. No new writ had been issued, and the House had therefore not taken formal cognizance of the fact that Mr. DODSON had ceased to be member for Chester. In order to remove the least shadow of a doubt as to his position, Mr. DODSON accepted the Chiltern Hundreds, or, to speak more accurately, the Stewardship of the Manor of Northstead. This is a place of profit under the Crown, and by statute the acceptance of such a place vacates the seat. Here it is not that the member is ineligible, but that his seat is vacated. He is in the position in which Mr. DODSON would have been if the Elections Act, after declaring a member against whom a petition had been successfully presented incapable of being elected or sitting for the same constituency, had gone on to say that his seat was vacated. Nothing can be more technical and subtle than the distinction; but, in order to avoid the merest shadow of a possibility that Mr. DODSON's position, if elected for another constituency, might be questioned, the Government thought it advisable that he should go through the form of accepting a trifling but disqualifying office under the Crown.

But this raised a further question. Mr. DODSON held one office under the Crown and then accepted another, and his seat was thus held to be vacated. This second office was the Stewardship of the Crown Manor of Northstead, and the granting of this Stewardship is a proceeding venerable from antiquity and of recognized convenience, but in itself of a very curious nature. The grant is made, not by the Crown direct, but by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who theoretically appoints one of his own subordinate officers. This officer is commissioned to be Steward and Bailiff of the Manor, and to have all wages, fees, and allowances pertaining to the office during the pleasure of the Sovereign. It is these words in the grant that are held to carry with them the consequences of the seat being vacated. These possible fees and allowances are a profit, and being held during the Sovereign's pleasure are a profit under the Crown. If a member holding one office of profit under the Crown is re-elected, and then accepts another such office, his seat is vacated, and he has to be re-elected, in order to be a member of Parliament. Mr. DODSON, if he gets in for Scarborough or anywhere else, will have obliterated his acceptance of the Stewardship of Northstead. But in 1873 Mr. GLADSTONE, holding one office of profit under the Crown, that of First Lord of the Treasury, accepted another, that of

Chancellor of the Exchequer; and in accordance with precedent added half the salary of the Chancellor to the full salary of First Lord. Why was his seat for Greenwich not vacated by his acceptance of this second office of profit? Mr. GLADSTONE did not think himself bound to act as if his seat had been vacated. He did not seek re-election from his constituents. He seems to have persuaded himself that, under the Act of 1867, certain specified offices, among which was the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, were allowed to be held in conjunction with other offices of profit. The Stewardship of the Manor of Northstead was not one of these specified offices, and therefore he drew a distinction between his case and that of Mr. DODSON. He owned that his interpretation of the Act of 1867 was open to serious question, and that it would, and even ought to, have been questioned had it not been for the dissolution of 1874, which shelved that and so many other questions of more importance. It is, however, inconvenient that such a question should remain undecided, and there are many objections which Mr. GLADSTONE stated he recently felt to the system by which the only mode in which a member can terminate his connexion with an existing Parliament is the acceptance of an illusive office which it rests in the absolute discretion of one Minister to grant or refuse. It is not surprising, therefore, that Sir DRUMMOND WOLFF announced his intention of calling the attention of the House next Session to the general subject of the mode in which seats are or ought to be vacated.

M. ROCHEFORT AND THE OPPORTUNISTS.

M. ROCHEFORT has taken the earliest occasion of proving that his relations with M. GAMBETTA are not to be complicated by any intrusion of foolish gratitude for the share M. GAMBETTA has had in bringing the Communists back to France. With M. ROCHEFORT principles come before persons. His hatred of Opportunism and all its works is in no way diminished by the fact that the leader of the Opportunists has incidentally done him a good turn. It is only fair to M. ROCHEFORT to admit that he has not been more insensible to M. GAMBETTA's kindness than he had every right to be. M. GAMBETTA had, no doubt, very sufficient reasons, from his own point of view, for pressing on the amnesty; but a disinterested affection for M. ROCHEFORT was certainly not one of them. He has allowed M. ROCHEFORT to exchange Geneva for Paris because on the whole he wished to have him at home rather than abroad. But there is no reason why M. ROCHEFORT should love M. GAMBETTA any the better for doing what he himself likes, and M. ROCHEFORT is not the kind of man to accept M. GAMBETTA's services without consideration of the motives which have led him to render them. In restoring M. ROCHEFORT to a country which in its heart would have been very well content to do without him, M. GAMBETTA restored and knew that he restored an enemy who meant to injure him whenever he could.

M. ROCHEFORT's line is evidently not oratory. His speech last Sunday at a Democratic banquet was read, like an Anglican sermon, and no doubt suffered all the disadvantages which belong to that method of delivery. It may have been a worse fault in the eyes of his admirers than in printing his speech in his newspaper the *Intransigeant*, he showed a kind of prudence hardly distinguishable from Opportunism. According to the report given in some other papers, he was interrupted while recalling the names of some of the Communist leaders by a remark that one of them, MILLIÈRE, had been assassinated. Upon which M. ROCHEFORT replied, "Yes! he has been assassinated, and we will avenge him." Probably the proprietor of the *Intransigeant* felt that to print this in his own paper, as coming from himself, might prove inconvenient, and accordingly it does not appear. But how will those who heard it said take its omission from what purports to be the official report of what took place? It may be accepted as prudence, but then it may also be mistaken for want of courage, and that is the last defect that can be tolerated in a revolutionary leader. This is not the only evidence M. ROCHEFORT has already given of a disposition to over-caution. No mention is made in the *Intransigeant* of a speech delivered by M. LANESSAN, a member of the Municipal Council of Paris, which contained some very heroic things. "You must have," M. LANESSAN

said, "not voting papers only, but chassepôts"; and when some advocate of moral force objected that chassepôts would not be needed, he put to him this pertinent question—"Then how will you defend yourselves against GAMBETTA when he assails you with 'his votes and his GALLIFETS?'" This ingenious and appropriate reference to the conversion to Republican opinions which the principal military hero in the suppression of the Commune has since undergone was checked by M. ROCHEFORT, and no reference to it appears in the *Intransigeant*. Of course this may be accepted as evidence of M. ROCHEFORT's desire to reserve himself for the greater enterprises which are in store for him. But the Communists of Paris may in time grow weary of these continual restraints, and desire to see their leader risk himself a little. It is just this which M. ROCHEFORT appears unwilling to do. He plainly wishes to keep out of prison. This is not in itself a reprehensible desire, even in a returned Communist; but it is one that M. ROCHEFORT's rivals—and we may be sure that he already has rivals—may turn to a good deal of account. M. LANESSAN, for example, may justly feel proud that he has dared to say what M. ROCHEFORT was afraid either to listen to or to print, and he may find others as ready as himself to admire his superior boldness.

The matter of M. ROCHEFORT's address was very much to the purpose. The Opportunist measures are not without their weaknesses when viewed from the heights of a more thoroughgoing policy, and M. ROCHEFORT described these failings in a way which was very well calculated to bring them home to his hearers. Instead of separating Church and State by the complete suppression of the Budget of Public Worship, the Government have turned certain members of one religious order out of their houses, and are now so frightened at the opportunity thus given to the Jesuits of playing the martyr, that they have determined to leave the other orders alone. It is only, however, when they are dealing with public interests that the Opportunists lag behind. Where their own interests are concerned M. ROCHEFORT sees them animated by a feverish activity. Their real programme is summed up in the exhortation given to their friends in every possible shape—"Get rich." Their business is to distribute places and dividends among themselves. They are ready to forego a *coup d'état* provided that they can count upon effecting a *coup de Bourse*. This, according to M. ROCHEFORT, is the real distinction between the Opportunists and the Socialist Republicans. The one is the party of the rich, the other is the party of the poor. The Opportunists have money and the command of the administration. The Socialist Republicans have only union, and that sense of numerical strength which the poor can never be without. But, though the Socialist Republic is the Republic of the poor as opposed to the well-to-do, it does not reject the service of the well-to-do. The history of the Commune showed that men who by birth belonged to the *bourgeoisie* could be as devoted to the interests of the proletariat as if they had been born workmen. Social distinctions count for nothing among men who march under the same banner against the same enemy.

It would be difficult to frame an address better fitted to take the fancy, and in a sense to promote the interest, of those to whom it was addressed. The distinction between rich and poor is more permanent than any distinction founded on forms of government, and it is one which the establishment of the Republic has brought home to the populations of the great cities. The workmen of Paris now live under a Government which, on the whole, is what they have desired. They would like, it is true, to get rid of the Senate; but, with that exception, they cannot quarrel with the mould in which the State is cast. They have a Legislature elected by universal suffrage, and a President elected by the Legislature. The old grievance that France is a Republic without Republicans no longer exists. The politicians who, by choice or by antecedents, were associated with the Governments that have preceded the Republic are now, with rare exceptions, banished from the service of the State. No names are any longer met with which, in the persons either of their present or their former owners, are associated with any of the past glories of France. Legitimists, Orleanists, Imperialists, and even Moderate Republicans, are alike proscribed. Yet, with all this, the workmen of Paris find their condition no better than it was before the Republic was set up. The benefits they

expected to reap from it are not yet theirs. They are still poor, they have still to work hard, they are still uncertain whether they will at all times have work to do. To men in this temper M. ROCHEFORT's address comes like a gospel. There is no need, he says, to despair of the Republic, because you have never yet had a real Republic. The real Republic is the Republic of the poor; what you have been living under till now is a Republic of the rich. Instead of losing faith in Republican forms, bestir yourselves to make them instinct with the true Republican spirit, and then you will find your wrongs redressed and your sufferings removed. There is no need to have recourse to physical violence in order to bring this end about. Universal suffrage belongs to you as much as to the Opportunists. When the whole framework of the Government has to be altered, violence may be unavoidable; kings and emperors rarely submit to be banished without offering some resistance. In France they are no longer there to resist. The places are all right, and it is only the men who sit in them that need changing. The field for a Socialist Republican is the next general election. Universal suffrage ought to give whatever answer the poor desire, because the majority of voters are themselves poor. The very fact, however, that the Socialist Republicans are poor is a reason in M. ROCHEFORT's eyes for not trusting too exclusively to the proletariat to furnish leaders. Here and there one may arise; but for the most part they must be looked for among men who have more leisure, more means, and more personal ambition. M. ROCHEFORT knows that, if he can persuade the proletariat to let him choose his lieutenants from among lawyers and men of letters, he can find as many as he wants. It is for this reason, probably, that he is so anxious to have men judged by their actions rather than by their social antecedents. A proletariat, guided by politicians like himself, is, as he justly thinks, far more dangerous than a proletariat which has to take its chiefs from among its own ranks.

MR. DODSON AND VACCINATION.

THE public will be thankful to learn that, whatever may be thought of Mr. DODSON's theory of vaccination, his practice is beyond impeachment. Disastrous as the next outbreak of small-pox may prove, we may look forward with reasonable confidence to having the PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD spared to us. For modes of enforcing the law let graceless doctors fight; he can't be wrong who has been repeatedly re-vaccinated. Mr. DODSON was able, when the deputation from the British Medical Association waited on him last Monday, to offer his own person as the best proof he could give of the importance he attaches to the precaution he is suspected of undervaluing. We can picture him laying aside his coat, and rolling up his shirt-sleeves, while the members of the deputation were addressing him, and then pointing with mild reproach to his scarred arms as evidence of what he had suffered in the good cause. Nor is it only in his own person that he has borne his testimony. He can say not only "As for me," but "As for me and my house," we have all been re-vaccinated.

It is naturally painful to a man who has fought the good fight in this way to have his orthodoxy questioned, and it may be admitted that he made out as good a case as he could for the provisions of his Bill. When all has been said, however, that can be said, it comes to very little. No analogy is absolutely perfect, and the expedient to which Mr. DODSON most resorted was to deny that to forego all prosecutions for non-vaccination of children after one penalty of 20s. has been inflicted is the same thing as to allow an indulgence for drunkenness to be bought for money. "Taking out a licence," he says, "is not 'the same thing as submitting to a money penalty.'" That is true, nor, so far as we know, has any one ever contended that it is the same thing; what has been said is that it is very nearly the same thing—that, whatever may be the original difference between the ideas, it is impossible to separate them when once it has been established that to submit to a single money payment carries with it the same results as taking out a licence. No doubt it is pleasanter to go to the nearest Post-office and take out a licence to use armorial bearings than to be brought up before a magistrate and sentenced to pay a fine. But when it comes to be understood that the result is precisely the same in the two cases—that when once the money has been paid, either to the post-

master or to the magistrate's clerk, all fear of further annoyance is equally at an end, that the man who can prove that he has once been fined 20s. stands in the same position as the man who can prove that he has paid 20s. for his licence—even the less pleasant process will be deprived of most of its terrors. At present there is at least the motive for alarm which is supplied by a sense of uncertainty. The man who omits to have his child vaccinated does not know what amount of inconvenience his obstinacy may not entail upon him. There is a prospect of many fines coming one after another, and there is the possibility that refusal to pay the fines may in the end land him in prison. Mr. DODSON's plea—the plea usually put forward for relaxing a law which is disagreeable to fanatics—is that it is unwise to multiply martyrs. No doubt in themselves martyrs are inconvenient things. They draw to themselves a certain amount of sympathy and make disobedience to the law interesting. But what proof has Mr. DODSON to offer that, if his Bill is passed, the number of children remaining unvaccinated will not be greater by reason of the immunity which will then be accorded to parents than it is already by reason of the feeling excited by martyrdoms? Let us suppose, for example, that a hundred parents are now made martyrs every year, and that each martyr is the seed of five members of the Anti-Vaccination Church. Before it can be determined that it would be wiser not to make these hundred martyrs, it must be considered how many children are likely to go unvaccinated if these hundred parents are let off with a penalty of 1l. each. If the impunity thus ostentatiously accorded in return for a small money payment leads a thousand parents to break the law, where will be the gain of not making martyrs of the hundred?

It must not be forgotten that there are many motives which lead to the neglect of vaccination among the poor besides the determined defiance of the law which is displayed only here and there. It is a burden to take the child to the doctor, and to have it more or less ailing for some days afterwards; or the parent, without being really convinced by the arguments of the anti-vaccinationists, thinks there may be something in what they say, and is at all events only prevented from leaving things alone by the fear that he will get into trouble. Take this fear entirely away, and the child will almost certainly go unvaccinated. Take this fear away in part, and the child will probably go unvaccinated. Leave the law as it is, and the parent, not knowing exactly what amount of inconvenience his neglect may bring upon him, will almost certainly put his doubts in his pocket and take the child to the doctor. Mr. DODSON entirely mistakes the objection to his Bill when he argues that to fine a man thirty times, and not to get the child vaccinated after all, is to bring the law into disrepute. The real question is not so much what the man who is fined thirty times will do, as what the man who dislikes being fined, but can put up with it for once, is likely to do. Can there be any doubt that such a man will be more careless about obeying the law when he knows that the worst that can happen to him is to have to make his appearance before the magistrates once and to pay a sovereign, than he will be if he knows that he may have to make thirty appearances before the magistrates and to pay 30l. for the pleasure of seeing his child die of small-pox in the end? The sole consideration in a matter of this kind is what kind of provisions are most calculated to get vaccination attended to as a rule. If Mr. DODSON will imagine himself a parent, with a vague prejudice against vaccination, but no desire to be a martyr, he will have no difficulty in answering this question for himself. There is no necessity to make the law more severe than it is. In theory, of course, it would be more consistent to vaccinate children by force; but this might have the result which Mr. DODSON wrongly attributes to the existing law, and create an active sympathy for the aggrieved parent which would defeat its own end. All that seems to be wanted is a vigorous application of the law as it stands. The child at present is not taken from the parent, but the parent's comfort is very seriously interfered with. The summons, the trial, and the penalty are always hanging over his head, and every now and then they fall. He himself may be sustained by his virtue or by the sympathy and subscriptions of his friends; but his position will not be romantic enough to make others anxious to share it, and in the great majority of cases they may be trusted to

take care that they do not share it. If for this constant liability to annoyance there is substituted a single money payment, this resolution will be very seriously weakened. Disobedience to the law will entail a certain saving of trouble, against which there will be nothing to be set, except the not tremendous possibility of having to pay 20s. If Mr. Dodson's Bill becomes law, vaccination will more and more be confined to those who have an active belief in its efficacy.

BATH ABBEY.

AT first sight there seems no reason why the diocese of Bath and Wells should not, like the neighbouring see of Gloucester and Bristol, be honoured with two episcopal chairs. Accordingly, we have known even fairly intelligent Churchmen disappointed at not finding a description of Bath Abbey in Murray's *English Cathedrals*. As the latest pre-Reformation form of St. Peter's, Bath, was that of a cathedral church, and the structure stands architecturally unchanged, we are not sure that its inclusion in the *Handbook* would not have been as excusable as its omission. But perhaps the information in question will more naturally appear in a future edition of Murray's work, for it would be only in keeping with the well-known repetitions of history that Bath should again become a fold under its own shepherd. The leading title in an episcopate which has yielded among its dignitaries two cardinals, eight archbishops, six lord chancellors, and eight lord high treasurers, we can hardly understand that so ancient and honourable a city should, in this age of the formation of new bishoprics and revival of old, accept for the final condition of its chief ecclesiastical building, the reduced standing of a parish church. Unlike Wells, which has always been served by secular canons and never by monks, Bath has been the subject of as many changes of constitution as there have been monastic or anti-monastic movements and mutations in the English Church. The first ecclesiastical transformation was from a Pagan temple to a Christian convent. With clearer evidence than that St. Paul's Cathedral succeeded a temple to Diana, it may be shown that Minerva presided over the hot springs of *Aquæ Solis*, and that a temple to her worship stretched its architrave within the precincts of the existing abbey. A visitor at the present time to the Waters of the Sun may see some recently excavated foundations of the original Roman baths, which are the only constructive relics of the "arcades of stone whence" (according to a Saxon poem, edited by the Rev. John Earle) "the streams hotly issued" until the fires went out in Minerva's fane. How far the materials of the Roman temple subserved to the erection (A.D. 676) of the Christian nunnery by Osric, King, or sub-regulus, of the Wiccias, is not certain, especially as the charter of Osric, a genuine and unaltered document, is received with suspicion. At any rate, if we are to believe Leland, who seems to have gathered his information from the prior of the later house, the "monastery of Holy Virgins" which Bertana, the first abbess, had been enabled to build by the grant of the lands of one hundred villains, was entirely destroyed by the inevitable Danes. As the English Chronicle states that the first ships of the Northmen appeared on the English coast in 787, Leland was probably mistaken in referring to an earlier date the destruction of Bertana's nunnery to these people. It was, however, superseded by Offa, King of the Mercians, whose many ecclesiastical works must have cost him almost as much as the famous dyke by which they were protected. In keeping with the spirit of his time, when the celibate rule was not practised, Offa here in 775 erected a church to St. Peter, in connexion with a college for secular canons, who married and gave in marriage, and chanted their litanies till the flood of Benedictinism came and swept them all away. This, of course, happened in the days of Edgar, a prince whose character, when depicted by the monkish biographer, displays as many saintly glories as a minster window, and who certainly had only less reverence for chastity in Churchmen than contempt for that virtue in his own practice. Edgar having displaced (A.D. 970) the seculars in favour of a convent of Benedictine regulars, Alphege, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and canonized martyr, was appointed the first abbot. Three years later Edgar, either on account of the greatness of the church, or the greatness of the city, or the importance of both together, chose the convent minster of Bath for the place of his coronation, being therein hallowed King in the presence of Oswald, Archbishop of York, and a "heap" of other prelates, priests, and monks. During many centuries it was customary at Whitsuntide, according to Leland, for the townsmen to elect a king among themselves in memory of Edgar's coronation, the richest men of the place feasting the ephemeral monarch and his retinue, who, in all their ceremonies, were expected to pray for King Edgar's soul. Whether Beau Nash and other potentates of fashion as "Kings of Bath" were successors of these pentecostal sovereigns, as has been thought, requires more research to certify than we can afford.

At the date of the Conquest, Bath was the capital of Somerset, being the seat of the *summa justitia*, or highest Crown court in the county. This mark of royalty was derived from Edward the Confessor, who, at his accession, bestowed the burgh upon his wife, Edith; the Queen herself, says Mr. Eyton in his lately published *Domesday of Somerset*, thenceforward exercising "the

function of a high justiciar." Bath was alienated from the Crown by William Rufus, who first of all by a charter dated 1090 gave the abbey to John de Villula, or John of Tours, as he is otherwise named; and by a second charter Rufus granted the whole city of Bath in free alms to the same prelate and his successors, to be held in as independent a manner as the King himself held any city in England, that with greater honour he might there fix his pontifical seat. About this time it was ordained that to increase the territorial influence of the Church certain bishoprics should be transplanted from the smaller towns to places of more importance. Bath was a walled city when Wells, which was never enclosed, was a mere village. If the comparative magnitude and stateliness of the towns were a sufficient reason, and the architectural grandeur of St. Andrew's Cathedral were less, Bath might again properly enjoy the dignity procured her by John de Villula, the first Bishop of Somerset, who, forsaking his seat at Wells, became Abbot of Bath, making the fane of St. Peter there his cathedral church, and its prior and monks his chapter. The Abbey of Bath was thus united (A.D. 1091) with the Somersetshire diocese; and as spiritual and temporal lord of his newly adopted city John of Tours preferred to be called Bishop of Bath only, removing the title of Wells. Under this style he declares in his charter that "the head and mother church of the bishopric of Somerset shall be in the city of Bath in the church of St. Peter, to which holy apostle," he says, "and the monks his servants I have restored their lands." Bishop John rebuilt the church in grander form, and lavishly enriched it with eucharistic ornaments. He is also said to have enriched it with men of literary ability, but their works, if any, seem to have perished like his own structure. After reigning with no great mildness thirty-four years he died (A.D. 1123), and was buried in his cathedral. Leland saw his effigied tomb in the midst of the presbytery, at "which time" (c. A.D. 1534) "all the church that he made lay to waste and was unroofed, and weeds grew about this John of Tour's sepulchre." In magnitude De Villula's church probably surpassed the Norman cathedral at Wells, and was certainly so much larger than the existing Abbey at Bath, that the latter represents only its nave with a further bay. It stretched about a bay short of the present west end, but its eastern limb extended as far as the Literary Institution garden. The bases of the pillars of the Romanesque church may yet be seen about six or eight feet below the level of the present building; and the arch between the south aisle and that aisle and the south transept is still evident at the east end. The great era of church building in the neighbourhood set in during the bishopric of John of Tours, or within a few years of that epoch; and examples of Norman structures more or less exist at Swainswick, Charlcomb, Langridge, Tuerton, and Englishcomb. The last named, the most beautiful of all, the Rev. John Earle argues to be a miniature model of the Romanesque abbey.

The removal of the *bishopstool* from Wells to Bath had been in opposition to the canons of the former foundation, who protested long and vigorously against the wrong done to themselves. To end the discord, Robert, the third Bishop of Bath, who succeeded to that title in 1137, decreed that the bishops should henceforth be installed both at Bath and at Wells, and should take their title from the joint names of those places, Bath being first. The arrangement, however, had been without the confirmation of a Papal Bull, a powerful sanction that was not wanting in the subsequent and even more serious case in which the great abbey in the neighbouring valley of Glastonbury became annexed to the diocese. At the close of the thirteenth century that rich Benedictine monastery was gaining the height of its architectural and conventual splendour. To bring into union the three important churches of Glastonbury, Wells, and Bath, and to become himself bishop and abbot of the joint foundations was the ambition of Savaric, who obtained the episcopate of the two latter places in 1192. So splendid a piece of plurality was almost worth a king's ransom, and it is a curious fact that the Abbey of Glastonbury actually formed part of the ransom of Richard the Lion-heart from the hands of Leopold of Austria. Savaric was a relation of the latter potentate, whom he persuaded to exact from the royal captive the grant of Glastonbury as an item of the great price demanded for his deliverance. This transaction was entirely without the knowledge and consent of the monks, who had been bought and sold with their abbey, though it was not without the connivance of Henry de Suliaco, their abbot, who in order to create the required vacancy for Savaric, accepted from Richard the bishop's throne of Worcester. In return for the dignified gift of Glastonbury, Savaric gave back to the crown the city of Bath, worth 100 marks a year, which his predecessor John of Tours had purchased; and transferring the episcopal seat to the former place, styled himself Bishop of Bath and Glastonbury till his death in 1205, a title that was continued by his successor, Reginald Fitz-Joceline. It would require the pen of an ecclesiastical Homer to tell the story of the pious rage and unrelenting indignation of the Avalonian monks, who during twenty-three years were constrained to be represented as the section of a bishopric rather than as the brotherhood of a noble and independent monastery. To bring them to obedience some were excommunicated, some stripped and scourged, some imprisoned, while others were starved into submission by being stinted on one day to meat without drink, and on the next to drink without meat. At length (A.D. 1218), the contention ended by a dissolution of the union between Glastonbury and Bath, liberty being at the same time restored to the monks of the latter place to elect their

own chief. Had these been content with a bishop for their abbot the see of Glastonbury might possibly have survived the sixteenth century, and we should not have to regret that one of the chief Gothic buildings in England should, instead of being a cathedral minster, with all its honourable traditions thick about it, and also the centre of a lively city which it had created, have been reduced to a few roofless and fragmentary walls.

King John, who had confirmed Savaric in his bold appropriation of Glastonbury, further benefited the see of Bath and Wells by according to the monks of the one place, and to the canons of the other, the right of holding ordeals of fire and water, and the privilege of trying in their own courts malefactors taken on their lands, and condemning them, if they thought fit, to the gallows. It appears there was even yet one prerogative wanting to the content of the monks of Bath, whose ears were assailed by the chiming of the bells of the city churches before they had arisen to matins, and after they had retired to their dormitory. During the time of Prior John de Telesford (*ob.* 1425) there was much strong feeling displayed on the part of the convent against the town on account of this evil custom. After some years' dispute it was decreed at an inquisition held at Frome (9 Hen. V.) "that no one should ring any bells within the precincts of Bath in the daytime before the prior had rung his bells; nor in the nighttime after the Prior had rung his curfew."

Wood in his *Description of Bath* states that the weaver's shuttle was formerly added to the arms of the Abbey as "a trophy of the industry of the monks." The arms at present show no sign of a shuttle; but the reader of Chaucer will be prepared to learn that the art of weaving was practised at Bath in the days of the pilgrimage from the "Tabard." The Bath looms were once as celebrated as are now Bath buns, and the manufacture of the best cloth is still carried out at Tuerton, in the neighbourhood. We are told by Warner in his *History of Bath* that, under the auspices of the monks of that city, the woollen manufacture was established around the abbey soon after its introduction into England in A.D. 1333. The goodwife of Bath was herself so skilled a cloth-worker as to be able to pass off her wares as having come from the fine looms of Ypres and Ghent. It is curious to notice how much rationalistic opinion had advanced within about half a century from the time when the holy martyr's shrine at Canterbury was visited by that worthy woman in her fine headdress and scarlet hose. In 1459, Agnes Cole, wife of Thomas Cole of Bath, was charged with having boldly declared that "it was but waste to give to the Holy Trinity at Bath, and equally absurd to go on pilgrimage to St. Osmund at Salisbury; and that she wished the road thither was choaked up with bremmel (brambles) to lette (hinder) people going thither." It is not surprising that for the utterance of such outrageous doctrine Mistress Cole was sentenced to do penance in the abbey church.

By the neglect of the monks, or rather of the bishops, who, after Roger (*ob.* 1247) preferred to live at Wells, the Church of John of Tours was suffered to fall to decay, and, notwithstanding repairs and partial restoration, the Romanesque building, it is said, had by the close of the fifteenth century become so ruinous as to need to be replaced by a new structure. This great work, one of the latest specimens of historical Perpendicular, was begun in 1499 by Bishop Oliver King, who was principal Secretary of State to Edward IV. He has commemorated his achievement by a sculptured representation, on the west front, of Jacob's vision of angels, which not only caused the original dreamer to raise a pillar at Haran, but, by being dreamed again by Bishop King, caused the erection of Bath Abbey. The addition of an olive tree at the foot of the ladders and of the likeness of a kingly crown at the top is of course an adaptation of the parable of the trees choosing their king, which has served in the design for a fair pun on the good prelate's name. He died in 1503, the work of construction being carried on by Prior Birde and his successors until the time of the surrender of the monastery on June 27, 1539. By an Act of Parliament in 1543, Wells was made the sole chapter of the Somersetshire bishopric. The burgesses having refused the offer of the incomplete fabric of the church for 500 marks, it came by purchase to Humphrey Colles, who sold it (1542) to Matthew Colthurst, whose son Edmund, with more munificence than the rest of the citizens together, made a present of it to the city, of which it has since remained the mother church. The choir was not consecrated until Elizabeth's reign, the nave being even then unfinished, Bishop Montague completing this about 1609. The priory buildings stood on the south side of the conventual church. On their removal at the beginning of the present century it curiously happened that the revestry, which had been walled up at the dissolution, when again opened, disclosed the copes, albs, chasubles, and other garments of the priests and monks still hung round the walls. On contact with the air they crumbled into powder, like the long buried body of the King, found lying with his urns and ornaments.

The plan of the church is a simple Latin cross with a central tower; but Wood, the famous Bath architect of the last century, found a figurative meaning in its design, and the ingenuity of his interpretation of the mystery might have almost entitled him to give an opinion also on our great inheritance in the Pyramids. He discovers that under "a Gothic dress" it bears the quadruple proportions of an Egyptian hall, of Noah's Ark, of Solomon's Temple, and of the Jewish Tabernacle. The nave being divisible into six squares agrees with the Ark, the triple square of the whole church corresponds with the Temple of Solomon, and in the transepts of two and a half squares we have the Tabernacle. A

less remote illustration would have been Redcliff Church, which perhaps the architect of the abbey studied even more than Eastern types. It is true the storied magnificence of Redcliff is but imperfectly imitated; but we have the lofty and rapidly succeeding clerestory windows, filling the spaces between the flying buttresses, with tracery almost identical in design to that of Redcliff, the narrow transept, with its deep and high window, being also repeated. In Redcliff, the Third Pointed style reached perfection. Bath Abbey, with its four centred pier arches, and their rather poor capitals and broad and shallow ogee mouldings, shows marks of the decline that had set in long before its erection. But there is much to admire in the church, not the least satisfactory portion of the exterior being the west front, which Mr. Freeman calls an "honest front," as not outgrowing constructive necessity and being a true ending to the nave and aisles. Wells, with its storied tabernacles for the display of statuary, is like a magnificent reded, which in reduced proportions would be more appropriate to the high altar, where its imagery would be safe from the corroding atmosphere. In Bath, with its turrets and battlements, transomed window and moderate ornament, we have both dignity and simplicity. Sir Gilbert Scott's restoration of the fabric was effected before the S. P. A. B. had begun its system of protests, or there would have been some not unreasonable resistance to the destruction of the coved plaster ceiling of Bishop Montague, which has been replaced by a fan-traceried vaulting in continuation of that of the choir. Its loss, however, is compensated by the true architectural character of the new roof, which will become historical without the inferiority of material that would endanger its retention under the most corrupt restoration of future centuries.

A NEW COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC SAFETY.

SINCE *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, it is doubtful whether a more audacious and successful hoax of the political kind has been played than the letter of "A Correspondent" which the *Pall Mall Gazette* printed on Wednesday last. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, it may be remembered, has more than once expressed its dissatisfaction with the conduct of public affairs, and with the slight signs of "getting forrarder" which the Liberal majority at present shows. The vigorous politicians whose organ our contemporary is are disgusted with these dilatory ways. They suggested in the columns of the *Pall Mall* that Mr. Gladstone should manipulate the constituencies so as to give himself a majority still larger and still more subservient; and they developed an ingenious theory of the duty of Parliament to sanction legislation, but not to legislate. Of these utterances the wicked Correspondent—a correspondent never to be sufficiently reprobated—has taken a base advantage. He excogitated and forwarded to the *Pall Mall Gazette* one of the choicest specimens of the grave *reductio ad absurdum* that we remember, always with the exception of Defoe's famous pamphlet, which doubtless inspired him. It begins most plausibly, and in accordance with the best precedents. "In view of the antagonism in prospect between the two branches of the Legislature on the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, it has been decided to convene at an early date a preliminary meeting in support of the Government." Clearly there is nothing improbable in this. On the contrary, the famous meeting in St. James's Hall four years ago, and that assembly at Birmingham which won from a profligate populace the title of "Collings the Afghan" for a respected member of the present Parliament, are cases quite in point. But the Committee which has been formed (on the Correspondent's authority) for this purpose has a soul considerably above such temporary work. It proposes to invite representatives of all Liberal Associations—the pure and patriotic Associations which have recently come under the notice of the Judges at Chester—to discuss the best method of securing "the following objects." The following objects are four. The first is a vote of confidence to console the Government for the rejection—a rejection, by the way, which is purely speculative—of the Disturbance Bill by the Lords. Secondly comes "an expression of opinion in favour of abolishing hereditary peerages and creating a Senate in harmony with the national will." Thirdly, there is to be formed a Committee of electors in permanent Session against the "possible immeasurable calamity" of a return, however temporary, of the Tories to power. Fourthly, there is to be set on foot an agitation to put down "the organized obstruction in the House of Commons, amounting to a rebellion against the national will recently expressed at the hustings." There are no hustings, by the way, now, but that is a trifle. The Committee, says this shameless hoaxer of a correspondent, will meet early next week to organize meetings throughout the kingdom—a reactionary term which shows his bad faith of itself. "Members of Parliament," it seems, "will not be admitted." Nor is this merely a piece of social exclusiveness, like that which led a crack Australian corps of mounted police to advertise that no younger sons of viscounts nor masters of arts of one of the universities would be admitted into their ranks. The exclusion is based, as a moment's thought will show, upon the soundest principles. The object of the movement is to reduce members of Parliament to the position of puppets, with a *mandat impératif*, which mandate is to be changeable at the pleasure of the Hundreds and at any moment. Clearly, there would be a certain indecency in inviting members of Parliament to join in a measure for their own degradation. But there is more even than this. It cannot be supposed that the sort of man who would accept the

commands of this Committee is the sort of man who is fit to share its labours and govern England. He may be good to vote and to sit up when required, and to perform other menial offices; but he evidently is not of the stuff which makes a Committee-man of the Public Safety.

Indeed it would not be difficult to show that the association of members on equal terms with the Committee would, in view of the duties of the latter, lead to painful consequences. We are fortunately able to supply some omitted articles of the programme, which the Correspondent at the last moment seems to have thought almost too strong for the confiding editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Article V. suggests that sub-committees shall be appointed for each constituency, to whom the members shall submit drafts of their speeches for final approval or correction. Article VI. proposes that when (in accordance with the suggestions of the *Pall Mall Gazette* itself) the constituencies have been duly manipulated, and all those which are likely to return Tories or plutocrats disfranchised, it shall be made compulsory for members to reside in a common lodging-house, under the supervision of the Committee. Article VII. provides that in the smoking-room of this abode there shall be a guillotine, at which any member disobeying the instructions of the sub-committee appointed to direct him shall be instantly "justified," to encourage the others. Article IX. defines a "rebellion against the national will," which is interpreted to mean the refusal at once to adopt any proposal endorsed by Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Chamberlain, or Mr. Peter Taylor. The means of providing against the immeasurable calamity, &c., alluded to in Article III. of the published programme are then entered into, and appear to be drawn from the practice of Chester and Birmingham. A strong protest is made in a rider to this Article against the impertinent and monstrous proceedings of the election judges, which in themselves amount to a rebellion against the national will. There is suggested as a matter for consideration the expediency of applying to such judges the guillotine treatment previously recommended for recalcitrant members. A similar rider puts the question whether Liverpool as an obstinately Tory town and one of great wealth ought not to undergo the treatment accorded to the *commune affranchie*—vulgarily called Lyons—in the sublime days of the French Revolution. The politician who makes this suggestion shrewdly points out that Lyons is a very sound community now, so that the best results may be expected from applying the same regimen to Liverpool. It is impossible to go through the whole of this very interesting appendix, which, as we have said, seems to have been withheld from publication by the Correspondent because he doubted the power of swallow of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, or perhaps because its contents, interesting as they are, are virtually included in the earlier and more general proposals. The public, therefore, but for the fortunate accident which enables us in a measure to supply the deficiency, would be left to its own ingenuity and knowledge of history to fill up the programme. Perhaps, however, the majority of educated persons would have no great difficulty in doing this. A copy of Mr. Carlyle's *French Revolution* would almost suffice to enable the dullest member of Parliament, who has voted for the Irish Compensation Bill and is going to vote for the Hares and Rabbits Bill, to do the filling.

We have treated this preposterous document as a hoax, and it requires something of an exertion to entertain the idea that it can be anything else. But it is at least worth pointing out that, like all good hoaxes of its kind, it contains nothing absolutely impossible. It is quite conceivable that the promoters of philo-Bulgarian and philo-Zulu and philo-Afghan and philo-everything-except-English meetings, should try once more the trick which has proved so often successful. The expression of opinion against hereditary peerages is taken almost verbatim from the *Secularist's Manual*, the book which used to be such a favourite study with Mr. Gladstone, and whose introducer now sits in Parliament by Mr. Gladstone's grace. The permanent Committee sitting against the possible immeasurable calamity of a Tory return to power is only an extension of the Hundreds, and expresses admirably the departure of those bodies from the old English system of fair party fighting. The nonsense about the organized destruction and the rebellion against the national will is only a repetition of nonsense that has been lately talked of at the meetings of a hundred Liberal associations, and which that lively young gentleman Mr. Herbert Gladstone was not ashamed to repeat the other day at Scarborough. Mr. Herbert Gladstone is dreadfully shocked at Sir H. D. Wolff and Lord Randolph Churchill; and he says, in a manner which we fear would have made Mr. Littimer smile, "We want to put a stop to this, and we mean to put a stop to it." So does the Correspondent's Committee want and mean to put a stop to all opposition to the crotchets which it pleases to entertain. The House of Lords and the House of Commons are alike to bow to its will. The former is to be abolished, and to be replaced by a pale copy of the latter, after which both original and copy are to be duly bullied into voting straight. There is nothing in all this which is in the least improbable as an expression of the views which it professes to express. The naïve crudity with which the plot is laid bare, and the bad English (for we think "possible immeasurable" would hardly find favour with most editors) in which it is couched, are certainly suspicious; but, after all, these are perhaps not reasons for absolute rejection. The theory that a Radical is of his nature rather a dull man may shock members of the party; but it has received some remarkable corroboration of late, and a complete want of sympathy with English political ideas

and traditions is not intrinsically incompatible with an ignorance of the art of writing the English language. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, however, is to be sincerely thanked by all Englishmen, whether it has published these extraordinary proposals in a spirit of noble frankness or in a spirit of guileless credulity. The net is spread in the sight of the bird with the utmost openness, and it is the bird's own fault if he walks into it. American papers have since the advent of Mr. Gladstone's Ministry to power been taunting Englishmen with their clumsy and reckless adoption of revolutionary principles, and declaring—not without some truth—that the States are conservative and even reactionary in comparison with the English Radicals. Certainly it would not be easy to rebut this accusation if the Correspondent's ideas have any foundation except in his own ingenious brain. Nor, on the other hand, would it be easy to show the connexion which has always existed between extreme democratic opinions and acquiescence in a dictatorship better than by reference to this programme. For what seems to excite the Radical wrath is not so much the rejection of particular measures as the opposition offered to their temporary pet. That Mr. Gladstone should not have his way unchecked is what seems to them—or to some of them—so horrible. All this is, of course, invaluable to the defenders of the Constitution, because it strengthens their hands immensely, and must infallibly hasten the split among the opposite party which grows day by day more imminent. As long as the question appears to be one of allegiance on the old party lines to party leaders it is conceivable, though rather wonderful, that English gentlemen should allow themselves to be made instruments for the robbing of their Irish compeers, and even for the curtailment of their own customary and proprietary rights. But when a self-appointed permanent Committee issues orders to them how they shall vote, it is to be hoped that common sense and spirit will once more make themselves felt. The Liberal county members have proved remarkably docile to the Government Whips. But it may be hoped that they and their likes would think twice before accepting the dictation of an Executive communicated to them in documents signed Snooks or Shufflebottom. However this may be—and really the long suffering of Liberal members is so remarkable just now that there is no knowing what might happen—the common sense of the English people of that immense majority which is neither Radical nor Tory, but has a dim feeling of personal independence and of Parliamentary integrity, might be trusted to revolt against such a proceeding. This, no doubt, the wicked Correspondent saw, and the *Pall Mall* has amiably lent itself to his well-meant but immoral tactics.

COLOGNE CATHEDRAL.

IT appears from a somewhat querulous article in the *Tablet* that a clause inserted by the Emperor's express desire in Prince Bismarck's recent Ecclesiastical Bill, enabling his Majesty to recall the exiled Bishops to their sees, has been thrown out in the Chambers, and that its rejection will have one effect which many besides those directly interested in the matter are likely to regret. The Cathedral of Cologne, which has now been six hundred years in course of erection, is said to be on the eve of completion, and a grand religious ceremony was to have been held this year in celebration of the event, at which the Emperor himself meant to be present, as his brother, the late King Frederick William IV. had been present in 1842 at the solemn dedication of the second foundation stone of the cathedral, to which he had been a munificent contributor. But in the enforced absence of the Archbishop no such ceremony could fitly take place, and it certainly is a pity that what may be fairly called an event of national and even European significance should have to be passed over in silence. The final completion of a church which has been so long in building, and the roof and towers of which exceed the height of any other building, secular or ecclesiastical, in the world cannot fail to be regarded with interest by many who are neither Germans nor Roman Catholics. And Cologne lies so directly on the high road for Continental travellers whether to Italy, Switzerland or elsewhere, that many of our readers will have had frequent opportunities during recent years of watching the progress of the work. But although its recommencement dates from 1842, six centuries have elapsed, as was just now intimated, since the first stone was laid. And it will not be unseasonable, now that the task is so nearly completed, to recall briefly the details of a story which stands alone in the annals of Christian architecture, if not of architecture altogether. It is curious in doing so to remember how an article on the subject published more than thirty years ago in the *Quarterly Review* opened with the "painful reflection that a great cathedral can never again be built in this country." And yet not many months have passed since the foundation stone of a cathedral, not indeed on the magnificent scale of Cologne but designed to reach no mean proportions, was laid by the Prince of Wales at Truro. The notion about cathedrals universally predominant among us till lately, and half sorrowfully acknowledged by the writer in the *Quarterly*, that the echoes of the glorious nave and aisles could only henceforth be awakened to the footsteps of a small congregation, passing as through a vestibule into the choir and the beautiful side chapels "used only, if used at all, as waste places for mouldering rubbish," has now been effectually dispelled, and the nave and aisles of

almost every English Cathedral have learnt once more to re-echo the preacher's voice and the chants of an assembled multitude.

The present *Dom-Kirche* of Cologne, though it was begun in 1248, when Frederick II. was Emperor of Germany and St. Louis King of France, is not the first but the third cathedral of that ancient city, founded by the mother of Nero as a Roman colony and converted to Christianity by the mother of Constantine. Of this it used to be said that "he who had not seen Cologne had not seen Germany," although Coleridge dismisses it so uncivilly in his familiar couplet. The original church, said to have been built by St. Maternus in the first century, has only a traditional reputation. The second was founded in 785 by Hildebold, 19th bishop and first archbishop of Cologne, but was not ready for consecration till 873, when eleven bishops met in provincial synod to attend the ceremony. It was, according to contemporary records, a stately Byzantine building with double choirs and crypts and three towers; it took fire in 1089, but was saved—by miraculous intervention, as was commonly reported—and in 1248 it was burnt to the ground. But there was another, and to the religious mind of that age still stronger, reason at that time for erecting a new and grander *Dom-Kirche* at Cologne. We cannot enter here at length on the popular legend of "the Three Kings"—better known to English readers as the Wise Men or the Magi—who have given their name in Germany to the Feast of the Epiphany. Suffice it to say that Caspar, Melchior, and Balthazar were respectively Kings of Tharsis, the land of myrrh, of Arabia, where the soil is ruddy with gold, and of Saba, where frankincense flows from the trees. After their return from Bethlehem they were visited in their old age by St. Thomas, when he came to preach the Gospel in India, and he baptized and ordained them. They died soon afterwards and were buried together, and many miracles were wrought at their tomb. Thither came the devout Empress Helena and found their bones, which she carried to Constantinople and laid in the church of St. Sophia, but in later days they were presented to Eustorgius, Bishop of Milan, and thence Barbarossa took them at the siege of Milan, and presented them to the city of Cologne, where they were housed for the time in the old cathedral of Hildebold. But it was felt always that this was no fitting shrine for such precious treasures, and in the time of Archbishop Engelbert, long before the fire, the design of building a new cathedral had been entertained. It was of course facilitated not only by the wealth of the city, but by the shrine of the Three Kings becoming a popular place of pilgrimage, and the brotherhood of St. Peter was formed under papal sanction for collecting contributions. In 1322, just 45 years after the consecration of the former cathedral, the choir of the new one, rising to a height of 208 feet, was consecrated with great solemnity and state, and began to be used for the services of the Church. There the Elector Palatine Rupert was crowned Emperor in 1400 on the feast of the *Drei Könige* (Epiphany), and there in 1402 his son, the Elector Louis, was married to Blanche, daughter of Henry IV. But the building advanced slowly, and it was not till 1437, nearly two centuries after the original foundation, that the southern tower was completed, and ready to receive the bells previously hung in a wooden belfry. Then followed a period of religious decline and artistic change, not favourable to church building or to Gothic architecture, and from 1509 the work seems to have come to a standstill altogether, the north aisles only being completed besides the choir; the walls of the south aisles and transepts were partly built, the nave was not even begun, the southern tower had reached the height of 170 feet, the northern tower scarcely showed as yet. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries nothing was done to the building, but in the eighteenth the Chapter exemplified the vile taste of the age in re-decorating, and of course spoiling, the interior. But at the close of the century the Chapter itself, comprising forty-six members, of whom nearly all were Dukes, Princes, or Counts of the Holy Roman Empire, was dissolved and the last Prince Archbishop, Archduke Maximilian, had to retire from his diocese. Soldiers bivouacked in the Cathedral, and broke ornaments and windows, but seem to have done less mischief than Cromwell's soldiery did in our cathedrals. It was reduced to a parish church, in the French diocese of Aix-la-Chapelle, with three priests attached to it, and Bertholet, the new French bishop, unconsciously added insult to injury, when he gravely advised the people to plant poplar trees round their fine Gothic ruins to make the most of the effect. Napoleon refused even the scanty pittance asked by the citizens of Cologne to keep the fabric in repair, and it became more dilapidated every year.

At length in 1819, when Cologne had again been restored to Prussia, the old crane, which had for nearly four centuries been suspended from the southern tower, fell with a crash which startled not only the ears but the consciences of the citizens, and they actually showed their compunction by erecting a new crane in its place. But they did better than this. Something of the "inspiring heat" which prompted Wordsworth's noble sonnet kindled their zeal, and in 1824 the work of repair was begun in good earnest, and sixteen years later a *Dombau-Verein* for bringing the original design to completion was formed and placed under the patronage of the new King, Frederick William IV., who took the matter up very warmly, and promised an annual contribution of 50,000 thalers—about 8,000*l.*—towards carrying on the work. On September 4, 1842, nearly six hundred years after the first foundation-stone had been laid, the King himself laid the second, in the presence of a brilliant assemblage of civil and ecclesiastical potentates, and a vast concourse of spectators, amid

all the grandest musical and ceremonial splendours of Roman Catholic worship. From that day forward the work proceeded steadily, and was taken up as a matter of national and indeed of European interest. The Queen of England was among the royal contributors, and herself assisted to place a bracket in the centre arch of the north front. The present Emperor has not, we believe, shown less zeal in the matter than his predecessor, and it is certainly unfortunate that the existing religious complications of Germany should prevent his taking as prominent a part in the consecration of the completed fabric, as the late King took in the laying of the new foundation stone some forty years ago. On the architectural and ornamental details of the building we have no space to enter here. To our own taste, we must confess, the immense height has always seemed to require a greater length for the due proportion and effect of a gothic church. Nor does it impress us, as a whole, with the same awful solemnity as some of the older cathedrals, both in the north and south of Europe. But it would be ungracious at this moment to indulge in criticism in recording the completion of what has been called "the most perfect example of the most perfect period of Christian architecture," and which is unique alike in its structure and in its history. According to a Protestant Prussian official, quoted by Dr. Döllinger in his *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches*, it is destined to be no less unique in its prophetic import. "I am certain," he wrote, "that the time will come, before the newly inserted stones are mouldered, when a common *Te Deum* will be sung in the Cathedral of Cologne." Certainly there has been something remarkable, and almost unexampled, in the friendly co-operation during so many years of German Catholics and Protestants, headed by their Protestant Sovereign, in carrying this great national work to its completion. But there are no signs yet visible of the *Culturkampf* ending in a feast of reconciliation within the walls of the newly consecrated nave. Meanwhile Cologne, which has been called "the Rome of the north," may be congratulated on possessing a cathedral, differing widely indeed in style, as befits a northern clime, but not unworthy, for beauty of detail and magnificence of proportion, to take rank even with St. Peter's.

STEAM LAUNCHES.

THE lamentable accident (if accident it should be called) near Shepperton, just a week ago, has brought to a head the complaints which have for a considerable time been rife as to the inconvenience and danger caused by steam launches to every other kind of pleasure boat on the Thames. As concerning this particular disaster we are as yet not in complete possession of the evidence, and in any case it would be improper to express a positive opinion on a matter which, as we write, is the subject of an adjourned inquest. It is already manifest, unfortunately, that this case will not offer any exception to the general rule that collision cases are sure to produce an abundance of hopelessly conflicting testimony. According to the one side, the launch crossed the river and ran into the rowing boat, according to the other the launch was keeping a clear course at a speed of not more than four miles an hour, and the boat suddenly changed her course and ran across the launch's bows. On the one side nothing is heard before the shock is imminent, on the other it is sworn that the launch whistled loudly. The witnesses do not even agree as to the side of the river on which the collision happened. Pending the result of cross-examination and the verdict of the jury (as to which we sincerely hope the jurymen will remember that it ought to be free from even the suspicion of bias or passion, and that for a jurymen to press a witness with pointed leading questions is not the way to insure this effect), we are confined to such reflections as are suggested by the most general aspects of the case. One statement of a general kind has been made in public, though not in court, which seems provisionally entitled to credit. A person well acquainted with the crew of the small boat which was run down has declared his conviction that the disaster cannot have been due to any incompetence on their part. If this may be believed, one consequence of general application at once follows. Whatever may be shown in excuse or explanation of the conduct of the steam launch will go to strengthen, not to weaken, our estimate of the intrinsic danger attending the navigation of the upper reaches of the Thames by vessels of this kind. Assume that no specific negligence in act or omission can be proved against the steam launch. Assume that she was competently manned and guided, which, considering that the owner, Mr. Desvignes, who steered himself, is a builder of launches and torpedo boats, and familiar with the river, is in itself more probable than the contrary; though, on the other hand, we have the fact, officially confirmed in the House of Commons on Thursday, that he has been twice fined and cautioned. Assume that no rule was broken as to carrying lights or otherwise, no practicable look-out wanting. The result, then, will be this; that, given a steam launch and a rowing boat within the distance involving risk of collision, in the far from absolute darkness of a summer night on the Thames, the rowing boat may, without gross negligence on either side, be cut in two and sunk, with loss of life. The less personal fault can be brought home to any one the greater is the risk of the conditions under which such things can happen. It needs no particular experience to know that a steam launch carelessly handled must be an extremely dangerous thing on a river frequented by smaller craft. But there is a suspicion, or more

than suspicion, that the truth goes beyond this; and that no skill or care such as persons of ordinary competence can use, or at all events are in practice likely to use, will avail to make steam launches otherwise than dangerous on such a river as the Thames. It is by no means necessary to suppose that owners of steam launches are by nature more reckless or indifferent to the safety of their fellow-citizens than other men. But it does seem established beyond fair question that when a man finds himself master of a steam launch he is apt to find recklessness very tempting, or prudence very difficult. The luxury of high speed is apparently an enticing one even in places where one cannot conceive that any man with eyes in his head should desire to hurry. And high speed on a long vessel in a stream abounding in sharp curves (of which there is one at Shepperton, probably not unconnected with this particular calamity) means unhandiness and great difficulty, if not impossibility, of changing the course on an emergency to avoid a collision. A steam launch does not look so very long on the water, but that the length is in some cases at least excessive as compared with the width of the navigable channel was clearly shown by one of the letters recently published. The writer described the violent manœuvres of a launch to effect a turning, during which it was made impossible for the rowing boat from which he witnessed them to do anything but keep out of harm's way under the bank.

The rule is as express and binding on the Thames as on any other waters that it is the duty of a steam vessel to keep out of the way of other vessels. If it were diligently observed there would be nothing to complain of but a certain loss of amenity, which of itself would hardly afford a just ground for restrictive action. But in practice it appears that this is reversed by the steam launches, and other boats have to keep clear at their peril—a state of things which for some years has been notorious, but is not therefore to be accepted as desirable or inevitable. Various remedies have been proposed; at present the launches are timed at the locks, and their mean speed may thus be checked; but this is little or no security against a dangerous speed at particular points. One engineer has proposed a limitation on the engine-power and dimensions of the screw, so as to make excessive speed physically impossible. But this would involve a system of inspection difficult to carry out; and we confess that, the nuisance being proven, we see no reason why the abatement should not be more complete. If steam launches cannot keep reasonably and safely clear of rowing boats in the parts of the Thames where the exercise of rowing is most used and valued, the most effectual way would be to clear those parts of them altogether, or at least to confine their activity within much narrower bounds by establishing close hours or other restrictions. One simple measure which would give some security, together with the least possible ground of complaint, would be to forbid any movement of steam launches after dark. But it is really not a case for being timid in repression. There is no question of disturbing vested rights or fettering lawful industry. It is only a balance of pleasure we have to adjust (though we do not know why people should be ashamed of taking some thought for the innocent pleasures of life); and it is evident that the mere luxury of the few should not outweigh the recreation of the many. The question is whether a small minority of the people who go to take their pleasure on the Thames are to be allowed to take it in a manner which interferes with the pleasure of the vast majority to the extent, not merely of annoyance, but of danger. Is it worth while for the community to buy one kind of pleasure for one small class of persons at that price? Thus we may put the case if we only regard quantity of pleasure; but, if there is any case in which the consideration of quality may be allowed some weight, surely it is where the matter at stake is the enjoyment of one of the most excellent and healthful pastimes known, and of some of the most beautiful river scenery in the world. And, if quality be taken into account, it is yet more manifest that the steam launch ought not to be suffered to hamper genuine boating. The sight of an able-bodied man lounging in a steam launch is at best nothing for civilization to be proud of, and for those who love the river of old there is a kind of profanation in it. We are not for returning to the policy of attempting to regulate the sports of the people of England by a paternal system of compulsion and penalties; but when a particular form of amusement appears to create a nuisance to those who are pursuing other lawful amusements, we may fairly consider the merits of the amusements themselves in determining which ought to give way. If the owners of steam launches did not interfere with the other uses of the river, nobody would want to criticize their taste. As it is, we are free to say that their pastime is an ignoble one, and the world would lose nothing by its disappearance. But if, from their point of view, the worst came to the worst, the river below the locks would always remain open to them.

So far we have assumed in favour of the steam launches, or rather of their owners, that they are not commonly navigated with any wanton or wilful disregard of the safety of rowing boats. But, if half the published complaints may be believed, this is a large assumption. The persons in charge of a steam launch can generally despise the rules of the river and the courtesies and humanities of life with practical impunity; and the possession of such a power is but too likely to lead to frequent abuse of it. Again, it is possible enough that the engineer and steersman of a steam launch may know very little of the rules of navigation and nothing of boating, and may be incapable of understanding the risk and trouble they impose on others. Right or wrong, they

enjoy the security of the brazen pot in collision with the earthen one, and the nature of things fails to provide a self-acting penalty for ignorance. In such a case, however, ignorance is hardly less culpable than wilful misconduct. We have said nothing of the damage to the banks, which is believed to be a serious matter, nor yet of the claim of the public, apart from the enjoyment of rowing, to have the upper Thames kept reasonably free from the noise and disfigurement of steam vessels. These are minor points, but they all tell the same way. As for legislation, our impression is that the Conservators have sufficient powers already, so far as making regulations is concerned; but the power of enforcing them has been admitted by Mr. Chamberlain to be "altogether inadequate to prevent mischief." At present the maximum penalty is 5*l.*, and that is seldom inflicted. If the Board of Trade chose to take up the matter strongly, a short Bill extending the powers of the Conservators in this respect might possibly be got through before the rising of Parliament; but in the conditions of the present Session, and in the face of the many perplexed matters to be dealt with at home and abroad, this is hardly to be looked for. One thing we have lately observed which seems in the meantime a fair subject of administrative action. Divers hoardings and blank walls in London are adorned with the bills of a Company who "threaten and intend," as the old Chancery pleadings used to say, to put on the river between Kingston and Oxford a large passenger steamer carrying something near two hundred persons. Pledges of competence and care may doubtless be more easily exacted from the managers of such a concern than from the owners of private launches; but it is impossible that it should be conducted without the gravest inconvenience to other craft. Is it too much to ask that, until order be taken in the matter by some more general provision, at least this new monster may be restrained from adding to the perils of the Thames?

JESUIT THEORIES OF TOLERATION.

A CORRESPONDENCE^{*} which has lately appeared in the *Times* on the "Expulsion of the Jesuits" has an interest beyond that of the particular question which prompted it—the attitude of the French Jesuits and clergy generally towards the Republic. The larger question however arises so directly out of the lesser one that we shall best indicate its bearings by briefly retracing the line of argument followed by "L. M. H." who opens the correspondence and the Abbé Martin, "Professor [of what is not explained] at the Catholic University of Paris," who replies to him. "L. M. H.," who writes in a courteous and temperate manner, and does not appear to be influenced by any spirit of Protestant narrowness or bigotry, professes to give the result of recent conversations held with a number of ecclesiastics, regular and secular, in various parts of France in reference to the present "persecution." All were agreed—as was natural—in denouncing the action of the Government, but they were also, it seems, agreed in admitting that the Government was acting, from its own point of view, in self-defence, though they denied its right to do so. Between the present "Atheistical" Republic and all friends of the Jesuits, which is afterwards explained to include all friends of the Church, there can only be war to the knife. This would, it was freely allowed, be the temper fostered in the *alumni* trained in Jesuit colleges, and it found expression the other day in the enthusiastic chants of a number of Jesuit pupils from the province of Toulouse who went on a pilgrimage to Lourdes. But more than this is allowed in the following significant passage:—

"We freely admit," they added, "that if the Roman Church could dominate, its principles must lead it to treat its politico-religious opponents in the like way. But we claim freedom for ourselves in every country which professes to base its government and institutions upon political and religious freedom, while our own principles forbid us to allow such freedom to others, wherever we have power to carry our principles into practice."

Nobody of course can fairly be surprised that not only the Jesuits but the whole body of French Roman Catholics should be irritated by the present ecclesiastical policy of the Government, the wisdom and justice of which has been very generally disputed by its English critics of every school of political thought. We can hardly even wonder that they should see in it "a war, a persecution against religion itself," the real aim of which is "to uproot the Christian religion in France." In further proof of this they point to the cutting down of episcopal salaries, the secularization of municipal schools and of charitable administration, and other details of recent policy. This dread unites in a common antagonism to the Republic those who have not usually many common sympathies. The parish *curés* freely admit that the work of religious orders often clashes with their own and that they would be glad to see their number curtailed and their action modified, but in the present conflict they hold the cause of the Jesuits and the other Orders assailed to be identified with their own. And hence must be explained the transference, if correctly reported, of the Jesuit colleges to members of the secular clergy, in order to escape suppression.

There remains however the grave question, touched on in our previous extract, to which "L. M. H." returns at the conclusion of his letter. Are those who protest against "persecution" raising a one-sided cry, or are they prepared honestly to abide by the principle which they invoke in their own defence and to do to others as they would be done by in the matter of liberty of conscience, teaching, and worship?

Not many years ago there were Roman Catholics of name and position both in France and England, and perhaps elsewhere also, who would frankly have answered in the affirmative, and would have meant what they said. Lacordaire and Montalembert are referred to as typical examples. But the writer complains that he can get no such answer now, and he cites two recent cases in evidence of the authoritative sanction of a very different spirit. During the last few years liberty of worship and teaching has been constantly asked for by the few hundred German Protestants in the little principality of Monaco, and it has always been refused, though a word from the Roman Catholic hierarchy or laity of France would have gained it for them. Then again the Cardinal Secretary of State vehemently protested only the other day against the sale of a site for an Anglican church within the walls of Rome. To the latter point it might be plausibly replied that the official protest was probably little more than a formal carrying out of the traditions of the Curia, while even under the rule of Pius IX. the English were allowed to have a church of their own without the walls, the distinction apparently being one without any very intelligible difference. But even so the traditions of the Curia must be held to bear witness to an assumed principle, and it is the more noteworthy that it should have been thought necessary publicly to reaffirm it, even if only as a formality, in the name of a pontiff who is known to be personally a man of statesmanlike temper and liberal views. But "L. M. H." does not confine himself to inferences from public acts. He appeals also to the direct testimony of his French interlocutors:—

My priest friends, I am sorry to say, only smile at this view, and frankly avow their Church cannot stand it. They say the school of Montalembert and Lacordaire is a thing of the past; that they are now counted not good Catholics; that Rome, by the Syllabus, has put down such notions; that if among their present ecclesiastical leaders there be any who share such ideas, they dare not utter them, knowing the prompt condemnation they would incur. Hence, they only repeat what I said above, "We must claim freedom for ourselves in free countries, but we must avow that our own principles forbid us to grant it to others, if we can avoid so doing." This gives a sad, hopeless outlook to the present conflict in France.

We cannot of course tell exactly how far these "priest friends" are qualified to speak for their brethren generally, but it does indeed "give a sad, hopeless outlook to the present conflict in France," if religious intolerance on the one hand is to be pitted against irreligious intolerance on the other, and there is an equal indisposition on both sides to "harmonize faith and freedom, religion and country." Nor can it be denied that the Syllabus, whatever its precise authority—and the whole Ultramontane school regard it as an infallible pronouncement—does emphatically condemn the views of Lacordaire and Montalembert, and that the latter especially was denounced after his death in no measured terms by the late Pope, and even refused the customary observance, to which he had an official claim, of a solemn Requiem at Rome. That the Jesuits have from the first consistently maintained the principle of persecution is well known; but it is fair to remember, on the one hand, that the Order came into existence in the very crisis of the Reformation struggle, and for the express purpose of combating the enemies of the Papacy, and on the other hand, that all the leading Reformers, without a single exception, maintained as strenuously the theory of persecution, and carried it out in practice, so far as they had the opportunity. The misfortune is that the Jesuits, as was abundantly shown in *Janus*, still uphold in all its fulness the persecuting doctrine they started with, and that the growing tendency of the last thirty years has been to convert Jesuit doctrine into the accredited teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. Leo XIII. is known to be no admirer of the Order, as neither is he an admirer of the fatal policy of his predecessor, but it does not follow that he will be able materially to remould the *damnosa hereditas* that has been bequeathed to him.

On the day after the appearance of "L. M. H.'s" long letter in the *Times*, it was answered at almost equal length by the Abbé Martin, who claims to speak the mind of the French clergy, both secular and regular. And we turned to his letter with some curiosity to see how he would deal with this aspect of the question. His method of treating it disappointed but did not surprise us. As to mere abstract political opinions he is very explicit, and we have no doubt speaks from knowledge. He declares for himself and for "the immense majority of the clergy in France"—as he had already asserted in an article in the *Nineteenth Century*—that they are "neither Legitimist, nor Orleanist, nor Imperialist, nor Republican," but are equally ready to acquiesce in any form of Government that will guarantee them "order and peace." In this he does but represent what has been for nearly a century past the normal attitude of his Church, which cares little for rival forms of Government, as such, so long as its own interests are secured. And it is true also, as he argues, that a priesthood, like the French, mainly recruited from the lowest ranks of society, is not likely to be particularly addicted to aristocratic sentiments or leanings. But if the Abbé pointedly disclaims any abstract political preferences, he is no less explicit in denouncing in the concrete "such a Republic as is at this moment disgracing France," and he goes on to intimate in pretty strong terms that its misdeeds cannot but prejudice the cause of Republicanism itself:—

And will any one say that the Republic itself, considered as a form of government, is not damaged by passing events? One must be very simple not to see it. Here is a form of government which appears in France now for the third time. Twice already it has plunged the country in shame and desolation, has deluged it with blood and covered it with ruins; and people wonder that there are those who feel alarmed when they see it for

the third time falling into the same errors. They wonder that the clergy of France has not forgotten the massacres of the Carmes or of the Abbey, the *Noyades* of Nantes, the dungeons and the guillotine! They wonder that in the presence of men who swear by Carnot, by Carrier, by Danton, and by Robespierre the clergy exhibit uneasiness; first on account of the Republicans, and secondly on account of the Republic. What *natreté*!

On these points the Abbé Martin speaks plainly enough, and his remarks offer no special ground for criticism. He next proceeds to deal with "L. M. H.'s" estimate of the views of the French clergy on liberty of conscience and persecution, against which he records a "solemn and categorical protest," as an entire misrepresentation of what they really think. He adds that "they do in fact ask for liberty on behalf of all opinions which are not directly at variance with reason and the natural conscience," and are ready to grant to others the liberty they claim for themselves. The exact force of his limiting clause about reason and conscience, which is several times repeated and emphasized, is not very clear, for we are told soon afterwards that, while in the English Parliament there is only one Bradlaugh, the French "House of Deputies and Senate are filled with Bradlaughs," and nobody desires to turn them out, though the clergy do not vote for them. Yet we had been assured before that the clergy hate the existing Republic, not *quâ* Republic but because they hate "the Republicans who crowd the Parliament." Does not the Abbé mean that they acquiesce in a "Parliament full of Bradlaughs," just as they acquiesce in the principle of religious liberty for all opinions, simply because it would be useless under present circumstances to contend against either? If he means that they accept the principle itself, as Lacordaire and Montalembert accepted it, he has entirely failed to meet the startling testimonies to the contrary adduced by the writer he had set himself to refute. To say that there is a persecuting tendency among French Liberals who just now are in the ascendant, may be quite true, and is freely admitted by "L. M. H." The question is whether their present victims, if their relative positions were reversed, would not deal to others the measure they so bitterly resent having dealt to themselves. And on this point the Abbé throws little fresh light. His opponent's argument from Monaco is met, or rather evaded, in a rambling paragraph about "the famous Mr. Bradlaugh," so absurdly irrelevant that it reads like a longwinded and clumsy attempt at jocosity. The Cardinal Secretary's protest against the new Anglican Church in Rome is passed over in silence. In short, when he is concerned with the political sentiments of the French clergy, and their grounds for disliking the present régime, the Abbé Martin speaks freely and intelligibly, and with every appearance of being well informed; in dealing with the graver question of their true estimate of the principle of liberty of conscience he seems to write under constraint—as having the fear of the Syllabus, or of its popular exponents before his eyes; and it is not easy to arrive at a clear appreciation of his meaning. Most likely he has never cared to analyse it too closely in his own mind. But the French Catholics may rest assured that the sympathy felt in many quarters with their protests against the "persecution" to which they are subjected is seriously prejudiced by this hesitation, or worse than hesitation, on their part—and not on their part only—to accept frankly and unreservedly in their dealings with others the principle to which they so eagerly appeal in their own defence. We do not say that this excuses the policy of their adversaries; that is no true toleration which has not learnt to tolerate the intolerant. But it explains what it does not excuse. If the eloquent protests of Montalembert against the Inquisition and the dragonnades are condemned as heterodox, and he himself is thrust aside as "not a good Catholic," we can hardly wonder, though we may deplore it, if those now in power in France take their orthodox countrymen at their word, and seek forcibly to suppress while they have the opportunity those whose avowed principles, if the tables were turned, would prove fatal to themselves.

IMPOVERISHED LANDLORDS.

MANY ladies, on taking their first drive after arriving in London for the present season, found the houses of a number of their friends shut up, with "To be let furnished" printed on notices affixed to the windows; and on looking in their Red Books for the addresses of such of their acquaintances as usually take houses for the season, there were none to be found. "Where are the So-and-sos?" was a question constantly heard, with the usual answer that they were not coming up to town this season, or that they were going to hotels or lodgings. Instead of the fashionable papers being filled with descriptions of the balls and banquets given by great people, it is far more common to find notices that "the Earl and Countess of Rabbitborough have left Boodle's Hotel, Albemarle Street, for Shortrent Castle, Pootshire," or that "Lord and Lady Narrowphile have left England for a lengthened tour on the Continent." There are comparatively few balls, horses are not selling well at Tattersall's, there are fewer smart carriages than usual in the Park, and tradespeople are complaining bitterly of the flatness of the season. Heartrending stories are circulated about reduced rents, and many hapless Irishmen say that they are receiving no rents at all. Altogether, good society declares itself to be in a very bad way. It would seem that Rotten Row is filled with beggars, that the Clubs are little better than casual wards, and that the hospitable have to feed the hungry, without expecting to receive from them again. We have

been much preached at for some years about pauperization; and it now appears that one of the most pauperizing of influences is the possession of a large landed estate.

We always entertain a respectful sympathy for the poor and needy, and we are painfully alive to the fact that very many landlords are suffering serious and most trying losses through non-payment or reduction of rents, the bankruptcy of tenants, and unlet farms. Most manfully too, in many cases, are the landowners facing their losses, and putting themselves to great personal inconveniences in order to help their hard-striving tenants. Large houses are shut up, summer trips are relinquished, and backs are turned on tempting purchases. Hard-hit British landlords have faced their difficulties with the pluck for which their race has always been distinguished, and an amount of good feeling has been shown which goes far to prove that there is still some sort of feudal attachment existing between landlords and tenants. All such distressed landowners as these fairly come under the category of deserving poor. Unfortunately, however, among impoverished landlords, as among other descriptions of poor people, there is a great deal of imposition; and there are not a few cases which are worthy of the notice of the Mendicity Society. Much as we sympathize with landowners who are hardly pressed and inconvenienced through the loss of their rents, we feel little pity for those who are taking advantage of trifling losses to pose as martyrs. To follow the fashion is the vital principle of good society; but fashions are sometimes inconvenient. To obtain the services of Mlle. Sarah Bernhardt for the amusement of one's friends at an evening party, to collect pictures, china, and old armour, to drive perfectly matched teams, to belong to White's or Arthur's, are all fashions which for various reasons it is not always easy to follow. Just at present, on the other hand, there happens to be a fashion which is far more easily complied with. It is the correct thing now to be poor, and most people will find little difficulty in accommodating themselves to this fashion. Not unfrequently the profession of shortness of funds is honest and genuine enough; but then this sudden ostentation of poverty implies previous wealth, which is sometimes purely imaginary. The public again are left to infer that the man who is at present suffering from a temporary reduction of rents will be a rich man when his farms are re-let and his tenants are able to pay their usual rents. Surely if a landlord, who apparently enjoys plenty of the good things of this life, complains bitterly of temporary destitution, his acquaintance must be worth cultivating, as he is evidently a perfect Croesus in ordinary times. It would be natural to argue in this way, but experience has proved the futility of such reasoning. The truth is that comparatively few of the people who take houses for the season in London depend for the most part on incomes derived from land. The owners of estates, if they have no other property, find their incomes so frequently diminished through farm buildings, cottages, and other estate improvements, that even if they have tolerable rent-rolls, they seldom find any available cash for London dissipation. The owners, too, of moderate estates are so often burdened with large country houses and heavy local expenses and responsibilities, that their large expenditure at home leaves too narrow a margin to allow of the cost of a London season on a scale at all commensurate with their social position. Setting aside, therefore, very well-acred proprietors, the country gentlemen who annually take London houses during May, June, and July are generally men who have small estates and comfortable incomes from other sources. Accordingly, when a man who receives several thousands a year from personal property, and but a few hundreds from land, professes himself terribly impoverished because he has been obliged to allow his tenants a reduction of ten per cent. in their rents, we venture to think him rather a humbug. We allow that it must be very unpleasant to a man who has five thousand a year to have his income reduced by fifty pounds; but we do not think that he deserves on that account to be classed among the suffering poor. We feel even less sympathy for such a person when he makes his comparatively trifling loss an excuse for spending the season in an hotel instead of taking a house, and expecting his friends to entertain him, while he saves himself the trouble and expense of hospitality on the plea of temporary poverty; nor can we justify him for refusing to contribute to charities or beneficial undertakings on the same grounds. Some clever people of this sort manage to obtain as much commiseration as others who have lost a tenth of their entire income. There are some, too, who are not above stinting their children, or even facing their wives' anger or sorrow, on the strength of their diminutive agricultural losses. That people in general had a few years ago acquired a habit of living up to, if not beyond, their incomes, is true enough; but that fact does not justify parsimony or false pretences. We honour men who wish to reduce their expenditure within moderate limits, or to save, if need be, for those who are to follow them; but it is quite another matter to affect losses which are purely imaginary. Those who have a few hundred acres of land too commonly labour under the impression that their little estates give them great dignity in their own counties and an important social position in the metropolis. Of these dignities and positions they are both proud and jealous, and they would be much annoyed if they knew that any of their acquaintances were unaware of them. Not to have lost money during the last few months practically means to have no landed property; so it is essential for the English gentleman, real or pinchbeck, to be suffering from a reduction in his income. To have lost money through lowered rents and unlet farms means to

have much landed property; and consequently there are many who are ready to act the part of heavily-mulcted landlords.

Seriously as landlords have suffered through the agricultural depression, at the late general election there was no lack of them as candidates for Parliament; and, in spite of their alleged impecuniosity, more money than usual is believed to have been spent in persuading electors. If there is a scarcity of money at present, people seem thoroughly to understand the art of making a selfish use of what little is left. Indeed it is a remarkable fact that a large number of landowners who are at present bemoaning their poverty generally manage to get a thing if they particularly want it. With those who have really lost money, something of course has to be sacrificed, but it is seldom anything that they very particularly care about. It is in the item of charities perhaps that the greatest economy is practised, for in this matter a ready and simple means of retrenchment is afforded, and those who do not let their right hand know what their left hand doeth may make up small deficiencies in income by abstaining from any natural inclinations towards liberality. Many large landowners who have been obliged to make returns on their rents are not really much poorer than usual, because, when they were receiving full rents, they expended large sums on expensive and unnecessary adornments to farms, enclosures, and plantations, whereas now they only lay out such money on their estates as may be absolutely needful. It is natural that owners of landed property should consider their own losses in a more serious light than those of proprietors of stocks and bonds; but they certainly receive more sympathy in their distress, and somehow or other their complaints are more tolerated than those of the owners of depreciated personal property. He who goes about deploring that he has farms on his hands, and that he is not receiving full rents, is not thought a bore, but is treated with respectful sympathy; but if a man tells everybody he meets that he has lost four or five thousand pounds in a Gas Company or in Bolivian bonds, people have an idea that it serves him right, and so feel little pity for him. We fail to see why there should be any disgrace in loss of money in personal securities, if it is rather honourable than otherwise to suffer loss as a landowner; but it is not the less true that such is the conventional sentiment, although few people would care to own it in so many words.

There are landlords who live so closely up to their incomes in times of prosperity that even a slight reduction in their rents hampers them seriously, while others who have suffered far greater losses are not affected at all as regards their personal expenditure, because the wide margin which they always leave between income and outlay is not half obliterated. It is therefore far from being the case that those landowners who are most embarrassed have suffered the largest proportional losses of income, although they usually meet with the largest amount of sympathy. It is accordingly very difficult to know who do and who do not deserve pity among the many owners of the soil who are bemoaning their impoverishment. As a rule, in this as in most other cases, it is not to be taken for granted that those who cry the loudest are the most hurt. At any rate, if they are the most hurt, it is not because they have suffered the largest proportional reduction in their rents. Few fashions are of long duration, and we have little doubt that the fashion of poverty will soon pass away, like others, and then it will again become the fashion to affect wealth. In the meantime, landowners who are complaining or sulking may profitably meditate upon the losses and the ruin of many of their tenants. Where the landlord has to deny himself a few extra luxuries, the poor farmer has often to give up comforts which are very little short of necessities. We heartily sympathize with the genuine sufferings of impoverished landowners, but we recommend them to take consolation from comparing their sorrows with those of their tenants.

CRICKET.

THE Rugby and Marlborough match is almost the last event of the season at Lord's which has any public interest. We may therefore use it as an occasion for some more or less desultory reminiscences and criticisms of the play since the University match. The Rugby and Marlborough contest is not a fashionable affair; but, not the less, or rather all the more, it is a very pleasant spectacle. The lookers-on look on in real earnest, and devote very little time to lunching; none at all to the criticism of costumes. The cries with which old boys express their interest, their delight, or their dismay, are almost as loud as anything one hears from the vast throng that circles the ground when Eton meets Harrow. The cricket displayed this year, though the match proved to be one-sided, was more free and brilliant than that shown by the more famous schools. The batting of Eton this year was exceedingly "pokey," the boys' elbows seemed to be fastened to their sides. No doubt two very damp seasons of untrustworthy wickets explain the lack of dash, and the caution which occasionally degenerated into timidity. There was no such coy reluctance to hit in the Rugby Eleven. Most of the boys had played at Lord's before; their captain, Mr. Leslie, had played three or four times; and almost all were really young men rather than boys. The Marlborough Eleven, on the other hand, seemed little more than children beside their big opponents. Mr. E. E. Stael,

a most artful little bowler, who may some day rival his brother, is one of the youngest players we have ever seen at Lord's. In a match where weight and experience and the confidence given by a nearly unbroken series of victories were all on one side, it was natural to sympathize with the forlorn pluck of the Marlborough boys. The enemy was far too strong for them. Mr. Leslie got ninety-one runs, and Mr. Cave also hit very freely for his thirty-three. Too many catches were missed; and, if ever the Rugby boys play for either University, they will find that it is not safe to hit up to leg. They did so with impunity against Marlborough; but it is another thing when men like Game, or Pulman, or Webbe, or Hirst are fielding near the ropes. The Marlborough point stopped some extremely hard hits, and was often applauded. The fielding of Mr. Tatham was also admirable. We have already praised Mr. Steel's bowling; after puzzling Mr. Leslie with three balls in an over, he bowled him with the fourth, and just prevented him from making his hundred. But it was Mr. Leaf, we think, who performed the neatest trick. He gave the batsman three balls a little wide of the off-stump, and all twisting from leg. To avoid the chance of sending a catch, the batsman prudently left these alone, a plan learned from experience of Mr. D. Buchanan's bowling. The next ball pitched on the same spot, but with the opposite break on it, so that when the batter once more tried masterly inaction, his off-bail was neatly removed. This was really artistic, and reminded the pleased spectators of a similar ruse by which Mr. Fenton Miles once overcame the defence of Jupp. The batting of Mr. Bowden Smith and Mr. Walrond was very good and steady, and it was pleasant to see those old Rugby names so well represented. The two innings in which Marlborough only obtained ninety-nine runs do not call for much remark. Mr. Leaf played well in a somewhat peculiar style for his twenty-one, and Mr. Hill's free and graceful manner seems full of promise. Mr. Steel had been unfortunately hurt in the Rugby innings, when three fielders ran to the same catch and fell in a heap on the ground. The bowling of Mr. Arnold (left hand) and Mr. Hirst was very straight, and the Marlborough batting was not calculated to alarm or demoralize the bowlers. The fielding of Rugby, and the wicket-keeping of Mr. Cobb, recalled the excellent performance of Harrow and of Mr. M. Kemp. Marlborough must not be discouraged by the success of such powerful opponents. Rugby is probably good enough to play any school this year. Charterhouse is apparently very strong in batting, as the boys scored over two hundred and fifty against Midwinter, Rylott, and Flowers. Midwinter is bowling with great success this season, and Rylott is, or used to be, very dangerous to Elevens unaccustomed to the best professional bowling. For some years Rugby has scarcely contributed her due proportion to the University Elevens, but we may expect to see Mr. Leslie arrayed against the ranks of the light blue next year; and the Rugby bowlers are also likely to find an extended sphere of usefulness.

To turn from the works of boys to those of men, it must be said that Dr. W. G. Grace's cunning has by no means deserted him. His batting in Gentlemen v. Players at Lord's was quite faultless, for the bowling of Shaw and Morley was extremely difficult, and the wicket was exactly suited to both of them. When we remember that Morley, on a favourable wicket, dismissed the Surrey Eleven for sixteen this week, the merit of Dr. Grace's performance may be easily estimated. Fifty runs got against the great masters of the bowling art, when both are on their day, and both are suited with a rapidly drying wicket, are worth more than two hundred runs hit off inferior bowling, on a ground like a billiard-table. The list of amateur bowlers has received an addition this year in Mr. Rotherham, who greatly puzzled the Players. He bowls very fast, but his delivery seems to us more doubtfully fair than that of Mr. Evans, about which many hard things have been said. Mr. Rotherham has scarcely acquired the art of bowling many good length balls, but if he adds this accomplishment to his pace he will prove very formidable. The Gentlemen nearly threw away the match against the Players by carelessness in the second innings of the professionals. Mr. Steel was lame, and his balls, lacking their normal vivacity, "came off the ground like baked potatoes." The captain seemed reluctant to resort to strong measures and entrust Mr. Evans with the bowling. When he did bowl, he was exceedingly dangerous to life and limb, and one of his balls, being tipped by the batsman, struck Mr. Alfred Lyttleton on the head, and was caught by longstop. The match between veterans over thirty and the younger Players and amateurs at first seemed uninteresting, as many of the best gentlemen had left town. The new combination gave us Shaw and Morley on opposite sides, and the match ended in as close an affair as the Berwick election, the younger men winning by two runs. Mr. Royle, who is now so seldom seen at Lord's, saved the match by one of those marvellous pieces of fielding at cover-point which Oxford remembers and Lancashire appreciates so well. Dr. Grace again played in his best manner, and Mr. Vernon sustained his reputation for safe and brilliant hitting.

A curious, melancholy, and instructive affair was the match between Gentlemen of Scotland and Gentlemen of the M.C.C. This match had been announced as Gentlemen of Scotland v. Gentlemen of England, but the Northern Eleven found only a somewhat "scratch" team of amateurs prepared to meet them. Mr. J. E. K. Studd, Mr. Ford of the Cambridge Eleven, Colonel Kenyon Slaney, who had just scored over a hundred in a good match, and Mr. C. J. Thornton, were the most famous of the English side. The Scotch were inclined to lament the want of more worthy

foemen, but they received a crushing defeat. Bowling seems to be a lost or at least a neglected art north of the Tweed. Cricket is now a very popular game in Scotland. There are five or six schools which yearly contend for the championship. The Border towns renew the rivalries of the Border clans. Wickets are pitched in every green field from New Galloway to Golspie, and yet there seem to be few bowlers in bonny Scotland. Mr. McLachlan, of the Oxford Eleven, did not play. Mr. Robertson, the Middlesex fast bowler, was sadly to seek; Mr. Lang, who bowled for Oxford in "Kidley's year," was able to bowl Mr. Thornton with his usual punctuality and despatch, but was clearly out of practice. The other bowlers were possessed of an intermittent delusion that half volleys to leg ought to be judiciously alternated with long hops to the off. Though Mr. Craig got seven wickets, he owed his success mainly to the excellent wicket-keeping of Mr. Leslie Balfour, the distinguished golf player. The English side scored over two hundred, and Mr. Thornton hit a ball over the wall beyond the tavern. Though Mr. Ford was the only recognized bowler on the English side, the Scotch gentlemen scored most feebly. Mr. Lang made thirty-six, and defied all efforts to remove him; but Mr. Cotterill, a really fine bat, and one of the hardest of hitters, Mr. Balfour, and Mr. Russel, failed to serve their native or adopted country. After following on, Scotland did better, though Mr. Balfour's innings was not, as usual, *sans reproche*. The English Eleven got the necessary 93 with the loss of only one wicket, and Mr. Studd "took coffee," as the Zulus say, with all the Caledonian bowlers. "There was mair tint at Flodden," as the proverb goes; but, as at Flodden, it was the Scotch deficiency in artillery that told. Their fielding, too, was anything but exemplary, and, as their batsmen were not fortunate, they seemed all too rashly daring in their attempt to gather laurels at Lord's. The Northern schools and clubs must take this defeat to heart, and aim rather at producing good bowlers than at making huge scores of over six hundred runs against stuff worse than a college second Eleven could supply.

The chief event of the future is probably the match between the Australians and Gloucestershire, at Clifton. The colonists have not lost a single match, and the affairs which have been drawn were generally drawn in their favour. It is true that they have usually played local Eighteens, and their opponents have been men of straw, only too pleased to receive one over from Spofforth. Mr. Marshall, however, showed a stern defence at Newcastle, which makes it the more strange that he was omitted from the Scotch team that played at Lord's. The Yorkshire Eleven which seemed so certain to be beaten by the colonists was not, properly speaking, a county Eleven at all. In a match this week, which had to be drawn, Gloucestershire more than doubled the first innings' score of Yorkshire, and thus it is possible that the southern county may make a good stand against the Australians. But the latter have not played this year against Morley and Shaw, against Mr. Morton and Mr. Steel, nor do we think it very probable that a satisfactory match will be arranged. As things have gone so far, it seems scarcely wise to try to patch up differences, and to make a match at the very end of the season, when every one is out of town. The disputes between the Australians and the leading clubs are not quite intelligible, but they exist, and make the prospect of a friendly match seem most uncertain. No one wants a repetition of the scenes which were witnessed when the Australians were in America.

DRAWINGS IN BLACK AND WHITE.

THE simultaneous opening of all the summer exhibitions of art in London is a matter of much reflection to the indolent satirist, but he is apt to overlook the still more startling way in which all these fountains of aesthetic culture are simultaneously closed. The country visitor who has been obliged to put off until now his projected trip to London will call on Monday at New Bond Street only to learn that the Grosvenor Gallery shuts today. The same answer will meet him at the doors of the Society and of the Institute of Water Colours. He will be denied, in the same provoking terms, a sight of Beauty at the Graphic Gallery, and of M. De Neuville's "Rorke's Drift" in Bond Street. While fretting under these rebuffs, he will determine to spend his Monday morning at the Royal Academy, but the crowd of holiday-makers will daunt him, and he will postpone his visit to Tuesday. Let him abandon his last hope; on Tuesday the Royal Academy also will be closed for the season. We share his perplexity at the curious unanimity with which the exhibitions, like the persons of a chorus, leave the stage at the same moment, and we demand his gratitude for pointing out to him the solitary exception to so general a rule. The collection of drawings in black and white, at the Dudley Gallery, still invites him, and, in the present dreary condition of the art-world, offers much that is interesting and noteworthy.

The present is the eighth exhibition in Black and White which has been held in the Egyptian Hall. At first these collections, appealing, as it was thought, entirely to the professional eye, were not much visited or cared for by the public. Most people consider themselves competent to express an opinion on a finished picture, but not many feel this with regard to a drawing, especially if that drawing is not interpreted in colour. But gradually people have found it amusing to recognize the originals of familiar designs in

novels and magazines, and to see their favourite grotesques from *Punch* as they left the artist's hand. It may now be said that the Black and White Exhibition takes a leading place among the minor shows of the year, and would be missed as much as any of them. To the artist it is of particular value; it gives the public and his fellow-craftsmen an unusually good opportunity of noticing the faults and merits of his draughtsmanship. Much that can be slurred over in colour, or rendered by mere *bravura* of the brush, must be drawn with a clear conscience, or left out altogether, and the ordeal of an exhibition of drawings in ink or pencil is a healthy one for a brilliant young draughtsman to go through. We do not find this year any strikingly new forms of talent; the familiar names present us with excellent work in the familiar style; but we are certainly struck with the increasing absence of thoroughly bad work of the old-fashioned smooth school. Our young artists, if they seem to be striking out no very novel path for themselves, are yet learning to wield the pencil and the pen with more ease and precision.

Among the landscape studies by far the best seems to us to be Mr. Aumonier's "Southwold" (102). It is a large work in charcoal, showing the old Suffolk town, built along the level slope of a low hill that sinks into the sea on the left of the composition, of which the church is almost the only salient feature. In the foreground the afternoon sun, reflected, lights up the waters of a reedy "broad"; a stormy sky, with strong lights in it, throwing the town and middle distance into deep shadow. The drawing is in Mr. Aumonier's best manner, and shows a certain refinement and melancholy sentiment which he seldom attains in his pictures of similar scenes, excellent as these often are. He is a good landscape painter, but with a crayon in his hand he is unrivalled. One of the best landscapes here is a little drawing, very badly placed, of "A Kentish Homestead" (410), by Allan Barraud. The name is unknown to us, but it is borne by an artist who possesses a singular power of rendering in black and white the silver radiance of clouds that have discharged their rain, and the liquid shadows of a dewy landscape seen against the light. The drawings of M. Léon Lhermitte need no recommendation. "Les Glanieuses" (14) represents a group of women, gleanings busily on a sloping field, the harvest of which has just been stacked. It is difficult to define the precise charm of this austere composition, in which nothing has been sacrificed to prettiness or to sentiment. The visitor should be careful to note all M. Lhermitte's contributions; each has some special merit of style, though all are not equally attractive.

Mr. J. W. Waterhouse takes the place of honour with his ambitious drawing of "A Greek Play" (221), and has some claim to the honour, on the score of careful execution. But the imitation of Mr. Alma Tadema amounts to plagiarism. It is pleasant to turn from this work to Mr. Walter Duncan's vigorous "Bacchic Dance" (202), which in feeling and composition, and almost in execution, is worthy of one of the Carracci. It consists of two half-length figures, a man with the pipes, a woman with the cymbals; the leopard-skin flaps on the shoulders of the man as he blows the instrument with fervour, and the woman, with her head on one side, seeks to out-do him in the frenzy of her brazen clangour. Close to this accomplished work hang a number of original designs, illustrating fairy tales, by Mr. Walter Crane. We do not think that any one will examine these, or the other similar contributions by the same artist which hang in the gallery, without a strong sense of regret that a talent once so fresh, fanciful, and eloquent should have degenerated into so nerveless a mannerism. These drawings show an increasing ignorance and indifference to the just proportions of the body, and even to the typical characteristics of the male and female figure. In his disregard of nature, Mr. Crane now gives to his men as to his women the same angular chin, the same narrow chest, the same wrinkled and attenuated limbs, and presents us with no more vitality of figure than the Dutch doll can boast of underneath its flowing drapery. Mr. Crane's failure at the Grosvenor Gallery this year ought to awaken him to the fact that a much stronger and more accomplished talent than his could not afford to ignore, as he seems to have been doing, all study from the living model. In contrast we must praise, as a learned drawing in the nude, Mr. James's study (169) in white chalk.

The etchings are less remarkable than usual this year. Mr. Whistler has a slight, but very effective, "Old Battersea Bridge" (314). The most pleasing of Mr. Tissot's contributions is "The Emigrant" (141), a young woman, with a brave countenance, stepping on board an outward-bound vessel, the back of the study being filled by a network of rigging. M. Léon Richeton is skilful at the technical part of etching, but his want of power to seize a likeness was never more strikingly shown than in his portrait of Mr. Carlyle (15). Mr. Seymour Haden and Mr. Hubert Herkomer seem to have left etching to conquer the neighbouring province, as Dryden would have said, of mezzotint. However, Mr. Herkomer contributes a single specimen of etching in his "Blind Shepherd." One of the most powerful works in this class is Mr. Heywood Hardy's "Head of a Buffalo" (297), the extraordinary vigour of which would be more happily presented if the water through which the animal swims were better drawn.

It remains to draw attention rapidly to the most remarkable of the miscellaneous studies still unnoticed. Mr. F. E. Cox has a delightful race after a calf (73), somewhat in the manner of Mason. Mr. Britten's studies for a picture of dancing (83, 109)

need only a little more care to be very admirable. Mr. H. Stacey Marks, besides a humorous design representing the Dudley Gallery, as a nymph, receiving the Realistic, the Mediæval, the Intense, and so on, contributes two large drawings of a woman walking in a wood, listening to the birds (341), and of the same woman dipping her toe into a pool (358), neither of which is very successful. Mr. Matthew Hale's design called "Music" (346) is full of imagination and excellent in execution. The drawings of J. Jimenez y Aranda are *tours de force*, excessively clever, striking, and reprehensible; M. A. Lançon sends some excellent studies of lions and lionesses (429); Mr. T. Blake Wirgman shows his accustomed skill in a careful pen-and-ink drawing of "Mme. du Barry's Sedan Chair" (477). Mr. Rooke's "Drapery Studies" (559), for his pictures of King Ahab, in the Royal Academy of 1879, deserve attention for their delicacy of touch.

In the sculpture we find nothing that requires very extended comment. Mrs. Thornycroft, in her group of the Princesses Victoria and Maud (638), shows the delicate feeling for the grace and simplicity of childhood which has always marked her work. Mr. Mullins has done much better things than his terra-cotta entitled "Sympathy" (639), while Miss Chaplin, in her group of a cat licking a spaniel's face (641), shows her usual playful fancy and her usual lack of strong animal characterization.

THE BEND OR CASE.

THE Derby of the present year will be memorable for one of the most curious racing disputes in the history of the Turf. The general public like the greatest race in the world to be won by a great man, and they had every reason for satisfaction in this respect this year, as the owner of the winner was the Duke of Westminster. Racing is a tradition in the Grosvenor family, and this fact made the Duke's victory especially popular. Then it is considered most sportsmanlike to breed your own racehorses, and the Duke had bred the winner in his own paddocks at Eaton.

There had scarcely been a month's rejoicing over this happy state of things when a report was circulated that a mistake had been made, that Bend Or had not run in public at all this season, and that the Duke of Westminster had not won the Derby. At first people laughed at the rumour as an impossibility. It was said that no mistake could have been made about a colt which had been bred in the paddocks just outside the Duke's gates, and of course any idea of fraud was out of the question. Fortunately, too, the horse's trainer was a man of exceptionally high character. But in two or three days the report gained strength, and soon there was immense excitement among racing men, and even non-racing men, on the subject. The generally accepted story of the affair was as follows. Among other horses entered for the Derby, the Duke of Westminster had nominated two chestnut colts by Doncaster, one named Bend Or, out of a mare called Rouge Rose, the other named Tadcaster, out of a mare called Clémence. It was said that when the time drew near at which it was thought desirable to send the two colts (then yearlings) to the trainer's, they had not been in the best of health, and that they had been taken to a paddock at Newmarket for a change of air, before being put into training. It was when they were taken out of this paddock to go to the trainer's stable that the mistake, according to the rumour, was made. There were two chestnut yearlings, and the colt out of Clémence was said to have been mistaken for that out of Rouge Rose, so that the trainer subsequently ran Bend Or as Tadcaster and Tadcaster as Bend Or.

Improbable as this story appeared, there was said to be some evidence in its favour. The private stud-book at Eaton, according to the objectors, described the markings of the colt out of Clémence as similar to those now to be seen on the horse that came in first for the Derby; and, if this were accurate, that horse must have been Tadcaster, who consequently ran under a wrong name, and was disqualified for the race. The idea of the bare possibility of such a mistake having been made caused at first a kind of panic among racing men, who, remembering the leading principle of Turf law, that bets go with stakes, reflected upon the contingency of an entire resettlement of Derby bets. Many backers had won large sums by the victory of the Duke of Westminster's chestnut colt, and the prospect of refunding all their gains was to them far from inviting. They were, however, soon comforted; for, on carefully reading the second rule of racing, they found that, although it begins with the ominous words "The interest of the bets is inseparable with the interest of the stakes," an exception is made when an objection is lodged against a horse that has been the first to pass the post, on the ground of incorrect pedigree or nomination, "*after the race is run*," provided the horse "is of the right age, and that in other respects he has not transgressed the rules of racing"; and that the owner, "or a person on his behalf," has not succeeded "in starting him for a race for which he is legally disqualified," by fraud or false statements. In such exceptions as these "the bets shall go to the horse that comes in first." So far as regards bets, therefore, the backers of the horse which came in first for the Derby were assured. Nevertheless, if Tadcaster won the Derby, it was evident that a large sum would have to be refunded in the shape of stakes. First there were the Derby Stakes, which amounted to 6,375*l.*; and, as the colt had run under the same name as a two-year-old, he would be disqualified for every race that he won last year, when his gains came to something like 5,630*l.* Then,

although bets on his past races would probably rest undisturbed, there were the heavy bets already made on the approaching St. Leger to be considered, which would stand on a very different footing. During the Newmarket July meeting the case was mentioned to the Jockey Club, and the owners of the second horse in the Derby consulted the Club as to the desirableness of their making an objection against the winner. After examining several witnesses, the Jockey Club said that it was unable to give any advice in the matter, on account of the very conflicting character of the evidence at that time before it. The owners of Robert the Devil still hesitated, and their next step was to take counsel's opinion on the question. The barrister to whom the case was submitted advised them that they "had a case." A formal objection to the Derby decision was accordingly lodged at Messrs. Weatherby's by Messrs. Brewer and Blanton. The next stage in the proceedings was a trial of the case before the Stewards of Epsom races. Some fears were expressed that, even if that tribunal gave their verdict in favour of the Duke, the case might be taken into a court of law; but the objectors avowed their intention of submitting to the decision of the Epsom Stewards, whether it should be in their favour or otherwise. The trial of the case took place at Mr. Lowther's house in Grosvenor Street, and occupied part of four days. Many witnesses were examined, and the Eaton stud-book was carefully studied; the result of these deliberations being that the Stewards of Epsom unanimously decided that "the chestnut colt Bend Or, which came in first for the Derby of 1880, is by Doncaster out of Rouge Rose, and therefore the objection lodged by Messrs. Brewer and Blanton is overruled"; and thus ended what sporting writers have called "The Bend Or Difficulty."

It is needless to say that the result of this curious case has given general satisfaction; but, apart from the gratification which is felt at the Duke of Westminster's success, and at the confirmation of the victory so honourably gained by the gallant Bend Or, we think that there is another cause for agreeable reflections. Generally speaking, whenever there has been a Turf "difficulty," it has been caused by fraudulent proceedings or by sharp practice. Now, in the case under notice, with a Duke on one side and racing men on the other, the whole affair has been conducted in an honourable and straightforward manner. The inquiry was conducted in private, and we have no official knowledge of the evidence; but, as far as can be judged from the accounts given of the case in the public press, the principals on both sides acted in an unexceptionable manner. The Duke, on the one hand, placed his private stud book in the hands of the Stewards, and courted the fullest inquiry into the matter; the owners of Robert the Devil, on the other hand, consulted the Jockey Club as to the expediency of moving at all in the matter, and when that body refused to advise them, they consulted eminent legal opinion. Finally, they agreed to acknowledge the decision of the Stewards of Epsom races as final, instead of going on with the case in the law courts. We have heard it objected that Messrs. Brewer and Blanton ought not to have taken advantage of an unfortunate blunder to endeavour to wrest the great prize of the Turf from the hands of the Duke, when it was certain that, whether it was Bend Or or Tadcaster which first passed the post for the Derby, the winning horse was the property of the Duke of Westminster, and had been properly entered for the race; but it would be just as reasonable to blame a whist-player for taking advantage of an unconscious revoke on the part of his adversary when 6,000*l.* depended upon the points thus gained. People are not, as a rule, very scrupulous about availing themselves of legal technicalities, and it would be hard if men were expected to give up the chances of obtaining several thousands of pounds on account of chivalrous sentiments. It should be remembered again that, if Messrs. Brewer and Blanton had not objected to Bend Or, the owners of the second horses in some of his two-year-old races would almost certainly have done so. Some people seem to imagine that it was a straining of an unnecessarily severe law to object to Bend Or at all, but such an idea is obviously absurd. There are too many opportunities of fraud on the Turf, and of the two it is rather to be desired that the stringency of racing laws should be increased than that it should be diminished. Indeed we are half inclined to fear that the very suggestion of the possibility of such a mistake as was supposed in the objection to Bend Or may set inventive but dishonest minds to work upon the question of the expediency, under certain circumstances, of contriving to make such a mistake for fraudulent purposes.

Sporting writers have been bemoaning what they consider a very serious and evil consequence of the Bend Or dispute. Pending the settlement of the case—that is to say, for some three or four weeks—the St. Leger betting was partially paralysed. Racing men seem to have considered this to be a national calamity. It is possible, however, that there may be misguided moralists who might rather rejoice at it than otherwise. Complaints have been made in the newspapers at the exclusion of reporters from the room in which the Epsom Stewards deliberated on the Bend Or case. The presence of representatives of the press under such circumstances would have been contrary to all precedent. When gentlemen are kind enough to undertake the duties of stewards of race meetings, it would be hard indeed if their management of the business of those meetings were distrusted by the public, and it would be intolerable that reporters should claim admittance to their meetings.

REVIEWS.

WILLIS-BUND'S SELECTION OF CASES FROM THE STATE TRIALS.*

THIS is a work of such obvious utility that the only wonder is that no one should have undertaken it before. Mr. Willis-Bund speaks of it as "an attempt to supply a want which I have often felt in the course of teaching," and which we should think must have been felt by every one else concerned either in teaching or in learning history. "Again and again," the writer continues, "the question is asked, Where is the authority for such a proposition to be found? It is easy enough to say the Statute Book, or the State Trials, but to refer a student to either of those works has the effect of deterring him from ever again seeking for original information." Nor—the weakness of human nature being taken into account—can we very much blame the student. There is a legend of the First or the Second George getting into a rage with his Minister, and insisting upon the documents relating to a certain piece of State business being laid before him the next morning. The Minister obeyed; and when the King rose, he beheld three large waggons full of papers parked beneath his windows. Tradition says he consented to wrestle with the matter in an abstract. Such an abstract Mr. Willis-Bund has undertaken to provide for the historical student who is deterred by the sight of a wagonload of State Trials. And it is not to such timid souls alone that his work will be useful. With the best will in the world, it is not always possible for dwellers outside of London or the Universities to refer to Statutes or State Trials, or other such voluminous and unattractive works. They are not books with which a young man in furnished lodgings is likely to provide himself, or for which his landlady is likely to provide him with shelves. They are not thought necessary to the comfort of a young couple setting up housekeeping. They are not part of the stock of the ordinary circulating library; and even in libraries of higher pretensions books of this class are not always easily accessible. Perhaps the twenty or thirty volumes have remained for ages unsorted in a closet, and on touching they threaten to crumble into dust under the rash investigator's fingers. Perhaps, as we once discovered to be the case with the Journals of the House of Lords in an institution which averred itself to have been founded to supply "the requirements of scholars and literary men," they have been deposited in the cellar, where it seems as much out of the question to disturb them as if they were a fine old crusted port. Altogether, there must be many to whom such a work as Mr. Willis-Bund has undertaken will, if well executed, be, to use a favourite modern phrase, a great boon. And in many respects—we wish we could say in all—it has been well executed. No higher title is claimed for it than that of a compilation. "Original research into records and cases that are not reported in the ordinary books" the compiler has not attempted, his object having been, "not so much to seek out new materials, as to utilize old materials that are accessible to every one." The edition of the State Trials he has used is that of Howell, published in 1816, and of the Statutes, that by Pickering, published in 1763. In the case of the Statutes he has wisely given references, not merely to the pages of his particular edition, but also to the regnal year and chapter. We notice this with gratitude, because in Canon Stubbs's *Constitutional History* references are given only to the volumes and pages of the *Statutes of the Realm*, thus affording no help to the possessors of other editions.

The subject of the present volume is confined to trials for treason before the ordinary courts, from 1327 to 1660, cases of impeachment being left to be dealt with in a future volume. The work opens with an elaborate and interesting dissertation on the law of treason, which in its changes and development reflects the changing relations between the Crown and the nobility. "A severe law of treason meant a powerful monarch; a relaxation in the law a powerful aristocracy." The author however refuses to join in the praises so often bestowed upon the Barons for curbing the tyranny of the Crown by their resistance to additions to the law of treason:—

That the conduct of the Barons indirectly acted in favour of liberty none will deny; that that was its primary object, or that any idea of liberty actuated the Barons, few of those who have ever studied their conduct, will assert. The history of the early law of treason is a question of money; the Barons did not in the abstract care what was or was not decided to be treason, but they greatly cared for the cases in which their property was or was not to be forfeited: and this it was that led them to oppose the development of the law of treason—they lost and the King gained the forfeitures; hence the jealousy with which any attempt to increase the number of treasons was regarded by the Barons; hence the frequent repeal of all fresh additions to the list of substantive treasons. It was not until the Crown learnt that there are two ways of developing the law, express enactment and judicial interpretation, and that if the one fails the other will succeed, that the law of treason became really expansive.

It may perhaps be thought that Mr. Willis-Bund hardly does justice to the antiquity of the law of treason when he goes on to say that its "starting-point . . . is the celebrated statute of William I., by which all freeholders were compelled to take the oath of allegiance to the King irrespective of the lord under whom

* *A Selection of Cases from the State Trials*. Vol. I. *Trials for Treason (1327-1660)*. By J. W. Willis-Bund, M.A., LL.B., Barrister-at-Law, Professor of Constitutional Law and History, University College, London. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1879.

they held their land." The germ of the law of treason is to be found in the legislation of Ælfred:—"If any one plot against the King's life, of himself or by harbouring of exiles, or of his men, let him be liable in his life and in all that he has." For the Conqueror's celebrated statute there was a precedent in the law of Eadmund the Magnificent, imposing upon all an oath of fealty in terms which expressly assimilate the relationship between King and subject to that of "lord" and "man":—"Ut omnes jurent in nomine Domini . . . fidelitatem Edmundo regi, sicut homo debet esse fidelis domino suo, sine omni controversia et seditione, in manifesto, in occulto, in amando quod amabit, nolendo quod nolet." In this as in so many other cases the Conqueror did but develop and strengthen what he already found existing. Taking however William's legislation as the starting-point, we go on to the gradual definition of the law of treason, first by Bracton, and later on by that famous statute of the 25th Edward III. which the Lord Chief Justice of England is reported to have recently condemned as "lamentably ill-drawn." Next we trace the great extension of the law by the decision under Henry VI., "that the Act of Edward III. was a declaratory Act, and that there were common law treasons as well as those mentioned in the Statute." Under the Tudors the law of treason was developed into what Mr. Willis-Bund does not hesitate to call "a system of homicide." For the much-abused judges of the Stuart period the author makes a stout defence:—

Notwithstanding all that has been said and written against the cruelties of the judges under the Stuarts, if any one will take the trouble to examine the facts, he will find that the law of treason was on the whole more fairly administered under their rule than at any previous time.

We must not dwell longer on the introduction, interesting as it is. One thing surprises us, that though the author cites in full the Statute 3 Henry VII. c. 14, which made it felony to conspire the destruction of the King, or any lord, councillor, or great officer, he yet in his comments never notices the fact that it applies solely to the case of conspiracies by the King's household servants. To apply it to the King's subjects generally was more than its framers ventured upon, "lest," says Bacon, "it should have been too harsh to the Gentlemen, and other Commons of the Kingdom; who might have thought their Ancient Liberty, and the Clemency of the Laws of England invaded, If the Will in any Case of Felony should be made the Deed."

When we turn to the text itself, we find that it is more than a mere selection from or abridgment of the *State Trials*. The author retraces more fully the development of the law of treason, already sketched in the introduction; he recounts the successive statutes bearing on the offence, describes the course of events, comments upon the policy of the Government and the method in which the trials were conducted, often drawing upon sources not accessible to Howell, and adds some cases not included in that compilation. In many respects therefore, although the trials are more or less abridged, this is for the ordinary student's purpose not only a more handy, but a more useful work than Howell's. On the other hand, the fact that the trials are not given at full length—for even those which are said to be given "in full" are somewhat condensed—will prevent its superseding Howell altogether. We think too that it would have been better if, whenever Howell had indicated the source whence he derived his reports, Mr. Willis-Bund had done the same, instead of simply referring to the "State Trials," of which he speaks in a way which might lead the reader to suppose that it possessed some official character. When Howell has told us that his account of the trial of Colonel Eusebius Andrew is that "published by Francis Buckley, Gent. who was . . . an Eye-witness of all the bloody and execrable Proceedings," or that the account of the trial of Mr. John Lilburne is "written (the chief part) by the said John Lilburne," why should not Mr. Willis-Bund repeat the information? He has done so in Penruddock's case, Penruddock having written his own account partly in the first person. The knowledge of the source of the report is not unimportant, as there is clearly some difference between an official report and one put forth by the prisoner or his friends. In some of the cases we are struck by the frequent variations between the account given by our author and that of Howell's edition of 1816 to which he refers. He may, of course, have corrected Howell by the light of some superior authority; he may have sufficient reason for turning the Major Cobbet and Captain Far who appear in Christopher Love's case, into Major Corbett and Captain Fox. But sometimes Howell's version is so much more intelligible than that of Mr. Willis-Bund that we cannot but prefer the older compiler. The point of one of Coke's witicisms, such as it is, is lost when it appears as "Concerning this sect, their studies and practices principally consist in two acts, to wit, in deposing of Kings and disposing of kingdoms." It should no doubt be, as it is in Hargrave and Howell, "consist in two *de's*." Coke was evidently much in love with this ingenious alliteration, for on the next occasion he improved and expanded it, describing Garnet as "a doctor of Jesuits, that is, a doctor of five D.D.'s, as dissimulation, deposing of princes, disposing of kingdoms, daunting and deterring of subjects, and destruction." Here Mr. Willis-Bund omits the word "five." At p. 387 one of Coke's most flowery passages in praise of the King and Queen has been spoiled by running together two sentences which in Howell are distinct. Further on, Howell's account has been so abridged as altogether to obscure Coke's meaning:—

After some little discussion he [Sir Everard Digby] pleaded guilty, made a speech setting out the motives that led him to join the plot, and

concluded by asking that his punishment might be confined to himself. . . . The Attorney-General replied very briefly, "for it grew now dark," setting out Digby's friendship with Catesby, his religion, error, and heresy, his *precious idle rare presumption*, his fear, and false alarm, concerning his recusants.

Some further knowledge of Digby's previous speech would be necessary for the understanding of Coke's reply, even if it had been more accurately given. The unfortunate man had urged that the motives for his offence were at least not base—he had been moved by friendship for Catesby, by religion, by resentment at the broken promises of relief, by fear of yet harder laws against recusants to come. Coke proceeded to demolish him in sledge-hammer style, taking his pleas one by one:—

1. For his Friendship with Catesby, that it was mere folly and wicked conspiracy. 2. His Religion, error and heresy. 3. His Promises, idle and vain presumptions, as also his Fears, false alarms, concerning wives that were recusants. . . . —2 Howell's *State Trials*, 183.

We give this as it stands in Howell, though we have no doubt that the words "concerning wives that were recusants" should begin a new sentence. But the general drift of Coke's argument is plain enough here, while in the new version it is lost.

In Garnet's case it is possible that Mr. Willis-Bund may be drawing upon some more trustworthy account than the official relation reprinted by Hargrave and Howell. But if so, he should have named his authority, as his variations from Howell, to whom alone he refers, are not inconsiderable. We will only mention the most important. He makes Garnet say of the Pope's power to depose princes, "that all Catholics accepted it without question." In Howell the words are, "That this doctrine of the power of the pope, was by all other Catholic princes *tolerated without grievance*," which is more to the purpose, as tending to show that, in practice the doctrine was not found incompatible with a subject's duty. This version moreover in substance agrees with the account by Father More, given in Butler's *Historical Memoirs of the English Catholics*. Further down, in the book before us, Garnet says that "As to the Jesuits being privy to treason, it was impious to think that they were; he had asked some of them if they were privy, but they always denied it." If the very thought was impious, how came Garnet to ask such a question? In Howell his answer is logical. "Concerning the Jesuits, he said, That if any were privy to such horrible treasons, it was impious, especially in men of their profession: but said, that he talked with some of them about it, and that they denied it." At a later stage of the trial Lord Salisbury pressed Garnet as to a conversation with a brother Jesuit, Oldcorne or Hall, from whom five applications of the rack had wrung a confession:—

He [Salisbury] then reminded Garnet of what took place after his conversation with Hall had been overheard, how he denied this before the Council; that Hall had confessed with so many detestable execrations that it wounded their hearts to hear, and when Garnet heard that Hall had confessed, he asked for mercy.

The parallel passage in Howell is somewhat awkwardly worded, but a careful reader cannot fail to see that the "detestable execrations" were used by Garnet to strengthen his denial, not by Hall to support his confession, which the Government were only too glad to believe. It was Garnet who "stiffly denied it upon his soul, reiterating it with so many detestable execrations, as the earl said, it wounded their hearts to hear him." It was the knowledge, derived from Hall's confession, that these execrations were uttered in support of a falsehood which so wounded the tender hearts of the Lords of the Council.

Our readers will probably be weary of following out these small discrepancies, and we will therefore only mention some of those which arise in one or two of the cases under the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. It is but fair to say that, as far as we have tested, the errors are confined to a few only of the many cases given. In the trial of Gerhard and Vowell, who were executed for a conspiracy against Cromwell, Mr. Willis-Bund represents a witness as saying "That Hinshaw sought to engage Vowell, but thought himself to be unfit." In Howell this runs, "That Mr. Hinshaw sought to engage Mr. Vowell, but he answered that 'he thought himself to be unfit.'" We need not enter into explanations of the parts played respectively by Hinshaw and by Vowell in the conspiracy. It is enough to observe that in the one version it is Hinshaw, in the other it is Vowell, who hangs back from active work. In the trial of Christopher Love in 1651 for treason against the Commonwealth, we read that "Keeble [the Lord President of the High Court of Justice] addressed Love, and told him if they were to have a Presbyterian Government it might tend to the peace of the nation, but not with a Scotch *sercitude* or *united* by a Scotch covenant." It should be "not with a Scotch *limitation*," "nor *limited* by a Scotch Covenant." Love is represented as saying in his defence, "Had I been so hardly dealt with before the King's Court, I should not so much have wondered at it; but to be so dealt with at Westminster, I stand amazed." But in Howell his indignant protest is more pointed:—"Had I been so dealt withal at the juncto at Oxon, I should not have been so troubled at it; but to be dealt so with at Westminster, this is that at which I stand amazed." Whether by "the juncto at Oxon" he meant the Royalist Parliament which had sat at Oxford, or whether he was referring to those who had expelled him from the Congregation House at Oxford—an incident in his past life which he had already cited as an instance of his sufferings in the good cause—is not clear; but at any rate the contrast lay between Oxford and Westminster, between the Cavalier and the Puritan stronghold. Two points moreover in the case are

not quite accurately given. At one stage the Court had a long wrangle with a witness, one Mr. Jacquel, who, when the oath was read to him, would only lay his hand on his buttons, and say "he was as good as under an oath." Mr. Willis-Bund represents that upon this Keeble admitted him to give evidence. But from the account in Howell it appears that "the Court not being satisfied with that answer, pressed him further," until he was at last got to say that he was under oath. The author also seems to have passed over the point of the Attorney-General Prideaux's reply to the technical exceptions taken against the charge. Love, it must be remembered, was being tried before that iniquitous invention of the Commonwealth, a High Court of Justice, the members of which were both judges and jurors. The Attorney-General argued that the proceedings were in the way of impeachment, "and, I think, that in this way of impeachment, we are not tied to those very nice and strict formal rules upon indictments." Hale, one of the prisoner's counsel, would not admit the distinction. "Then Mr. Attorney makes a difference between the case of an Indictment and this Charge. I conceive that in this case there is no difference." All this is slurred over in the present version. In Howell, moreover, Prideaux is not so brutally frank as he is here made out. "The Attorney-General," writes Mr. Willis-Bund, "said if he was to draw indictments with all these niceties he should never get a conviction." This no doubt was what was in his thoughts, but we cannot find the words in Howell. "Mr. Hale's Exception," he there complains, "is still upon that way of proceedings upon indictments. . . . I must give it that answer still, that if you do in these cases put me to it, to express every particular circumstance of every particular fact, and every particular time, and that it must conduce in the conclusion of it, I must make you impeachments that will not be fit for you to read, nor hear." The nearest approach we can find to the words ascribed to him by Mr. Willis-Bund occurs later on, when he says that if he had laid the charge as Hale demanded, "I conceive I had done myself and the commonwealth wrong."

These are no doubt minute points. But in all legal matters minute accuracy is indispensable. If Mr. Willis-Bund's readers find that they may still have to refer to Howell for exact details, his work, however much valuable information it contains, will have failed of its main purpose. And though some of the variations may have been made with intention, others certainly look like simple mistakes arising from careless abridgment. That the author can be careless is shown by a remark referring to one of the regicides, Sir Henry Mildmay. After the Restoration, Mildmay presented a petition to the Lords, setting forth that his only object in sitting in "that pretended high Court of justice" had been to preserve the life of "His late Majesty of blessed memorie." To this not very credible plea, Mildmay added a medical certificate that the state of his health was such that if the sentence of drawing him on a sledge from the Tower to Tyburn were put in execution, it would endanger his life. Upon this Mr. Willis-Bund comments, "As the object of the journey to Tyburn was to deprive him of life, this certificate almost approaches the humorous." The reply that suggests itself is that Sir Henry understood his own business better than his censor. A reference to the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion would have shown our author that Mildmay was one of the excepted persons who were "reserved to such Pains, Penalties and Forfeitures, not extending to life, as by another Act intended to be passed for that Purpose shall be imposed on them." Mildmay's life therefore was protected by the Indemnity; but one of the pains and penalties afterwards imposed on him and others in the same category was to be drawn to Tyburn and back, after the manner of traitors. Readers of Pepys may remember how on January 27, 1662, the diarist, "going to take water upon Tower-hill," "met with three sledges standing there to carry my Lord Monson and Sir H. Mildmay and another, to the gallows and back again, with ropes about their necks."

Mr. Willis-Bund endeavours to disarm us by apologizing beforehand for possible inaccuracies, pleading that "no amount of care in a book of this nature could prevent some errors creeping in." We think however that we may fairly demand more care than he seems to have exercised. His work is one of such utility, and in many respects so well executed, that we trust that in a second edition he may repair the errors we have pointed out, and that he may continue it in a manner that we can unreservedly praise.

THE SONG OF ROLAND.*

IT is becoming a graceful and pleasing fashion with our poets to present in English dress those once neglected French works which were the delight of the centuries "before Malherbe came." The practice is one on which we ought every way to congratulate ourselves. The translators have a mine of wealth in which they may quarry continually, and always find something fresh, quaint, and delightful; and without their efforts the world might never know the meaning of *Fabliau*, *Chanson*, or *Lai*. We can hardly, even by the utmost stretch of a kindly imagination, assume that the ordinary English reader is likely to know anything of the labours of Michel, Meyer, Gaston Paris, Léon Gautier, and others

who have annotated and edited the *Chanson de Roland*. It is true that the thing might be overdone; there are many other *chansons de geste*, but we are quite satisfied with the earliest, which is at the same time one of the shortest; there are also many "Epics of the Middle Ages," to read which would require the long life and leisure of a patriarch; these were best left in their original tongue; and of *ballade*, *villanelle*, *virelai*, and *chant-royal* we have already had well-nigh enough.

Of the three principal cycles of the *Chanson de Geste*, the earliest and best are those which have the Great King Karl as their central figure; and of these the earliest and best is the *Chanson de Roland*. As regards the date of the poem, the MS. of the Bodleian is in the language of the eleventh or twelfth century; its author is unknown, although the last line says,

Ci falt la geste que Turoldus declinet.

Unfortunately, however, the meaning of the word *declinet* is not quite clear. The origin of the song may, according to a theory in itself by no means improbable, be looked for in those *cantilènes*, a collection of which was formed for Karl, and in which the French sang the prowess of their warriors. Each of these *cantilènes*, of which none in the original French form survive, celebrated one exploit; it was short, direct in diction, and rapid in movement; the compiler of the *chanson* had his materials ready to his hand in story and in verse; he fitted the former with episodes and filled out the principal characters; he took as much of the latter as was apt to his purpose, and amplified the descriptions; where his predecessors mentioned a fight, he described it; when they spoke of valorous deeds, he told of them in detail. Subsequently, as seems only fair, the poet himself became subject to amplification in the hands of his successors. The later MSS. of the Roland song, for instance, are full of expansions, additions, and *remaniements*, so that the suspicion arises that there may have been "editions" of the poem still earlier and much simpler even than that of the Bodleian Library. The tedious episode of Baligant, for instance, which Mr. O'Hagan judiciously omits, seems to us distinctly a later addition to the original poem, which must have dealt simply with the disaster at Roncesvalles, and the revenge taken by Karl. That the date of the first poem or *cantilène* is older than the twelfth century is not indeed difficult to show. What, for instance, was that song of Roncesvalles which was sung by Taillefer at Hastings? No one certainly ever supposed that he sang the long *Chanson de Roland* through; but there are passages in the poem as it stands which he might very well have sung before the army. Such, for instance, is the exhortation of Turpin. Again, the poem is full of that Saracenic terror which belongs to the tenth rather than to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the rage against the infidel of Spain was transferred by pilgrimages and crusades to rage against the infidel of Syria, Egypt, and Asia Minor. Yet the later rage—the enthusiasm of the Crusades—appears for the first time in the very last stanza, where Karl is bidden by an angel to go help "King Vivien fighting in the city of Imphe (query Nympe, *Nymphæa*, or Antioch?) against the Saracens." Comparison with the romances of the twelfth and thirteenth century, again, tends to prove the earlier date of this *chanson*. Its language is more simple and direct, its stanzas are shorter, its assonant rhymes are not dragged along to such a merciless length; the general reflections are fewer, the characters are more heroic; their virtues and vices are different from those of the more courtly Crusaders; they are not French, but Germans of the type of Tacitus; they loathe peace, love fighting, are free in speech, and ready of hand; their most sacred duty is to obey their King; treachery is the greatest crime; they are ready to shed tears, to pluck their beards, to swoon with grief; they vaunt their own prowess; they love each other as Achilles loved Patroclus, or David loved Jonathan; Roland, the noblest and bravest, would die rather than by one blast of *Oliphant* seek needless assistance of his king; their fighting bishop assails them of their sins, and enjoins them by way of penance to strike—*férir*: and those who die, he says, shall have seats in "the greater Paradise." Thus, while the internal evidence of the poem proclaims its antiquity, it affords us a complete view of the life of the Franks, the warriors and conquerors.

For this reason alone it deserves to be studied. But there are many other reasons. We may point out, for instance, the great figure of the King. He is no longer young in the *chansons*; he is *à la barbe chenue*, a greybeard, but in vigorous old age; there is no king like him, nor will be again till God judge the world; he habitually takes counsel of an angel; he stays the sun in its course, until his vengeance is complete; even in death he sits sword in hand menacing the infidel; he is grave and calm, even when his peers are carried away with wrath; he is heavily burdened with the cares of life;

Deus! dist li reis, si penuse est ma vie!

He loves his soldiers, and weeps for their death; he is implacable to traitors; he hangs all Ganelon's family after he has torn their chief to pieces. Great, indeed, must that king have been who left behind him such a memory as Karl. The poem might also be considered in its relation to the history of French literature. We might stop to show how in parts it attains to a pathos never reached in the more elaborate poems which succeeded it; how the dignity of the barons, their courtesy and simplicity, stand out naturally and without effort; how truthful is the poem. Or we might consider the work in its relation to the growth of the language. We are as yet, for instance, far from the ease of Marie

* *The Song of Roland*. Translated into English Verse by John O'Hagan, M.A., One of Her Majesty's Counsel. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

de France; the language is rugged; the poet has not yet acquired full mastery over the tongue. These, however, are only some of the reasons which make this *chanson* remarkable.

The total neglect of early French literature was so great in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that we are not surprised to find the *Chanson de Roland*, with all its followers, completely forgotten. It is only a hundred years since a French *savant* imagined that the song sung by Taillefer was a kind of modern lyric, and actually, to everybody's admiration, proposed a song such as might have been written by Collé or Favart. It is true that such rare scholars as Ducange and Sainte-Palaye knew something about the poem, though not much; but when in 1837 Francisque Milhel first published the Oxford MS., the surprise and delight of France were as great as if they had chanced upon another Homer. "We have," they cried, "our own Homer—Roland is Achilles; Turpin is Calchas; Olivier is Patroclus. Henceforth let no man taunt us with being without an epic."

The first difficulty in rendering the *chanson* is of course that of the most fitting metre. It is written in decasyllabic verse, and is divided into *laissez*—leashes or stanzas—which vary in length from twelve to thirty lines, with assonance instead of rhyme. Mr. O'Hagan offers us a specimen of what his translation might have been had he followed the example of Mr. MacCarthy in his renderings of Calderon, or M. Petit de Julleville in his version of the *Chanson*, in preserving the assonance. The example is such as to leave no room for regret at his choice. The metre he has selected, that of "Christabel," seems to us, on the whole, the best possible, although it is naturally open to objection. The "mixed iambic and anapestic measure" has fallen, as Mr. O'Hagan frankly states, into "much discredit as a lilting metre." This is probably due to the readiness with which it lends itself to the narrative verse in which the imitators of Byron and Scott found the ease which they mistook for genius. But we entirely disagree with Mr. O'Hagan when he thinks that the Song could be "beautifully rendered" in those heroic numbers which Keats and Morris have managed with so much sweetness and freedom. Mr. Morris might, to be sure, clothe the story of Roncesvalles in his own verse, as he has already done for certain *fabliaux*, but that would not be a translation. Or the Laureate, as Mr. O'Hagan suggests, might make it the subject of another "idyl," but that again would not be a translation. The most obvious objection to the metre is that it occasionally destroys the severity, simplicity, and directness of the original, and this not always by expansion, but sometimes by compression. Thus, when the Archbishop absolves the host before the fight in which they are all to be slain, his words are these:—

Camez vos culpes, si priez Dieu merci
Asoldrai vos pur voz ames guarir:
Se vus murez, esterez seinz martirs;
Sieges avez et greignor paréis.

which is thus rendered by Mr. O'Hagan:—

Cry *mea culpa* and lowly kneel;
I will assail you, your souls to heal;
In death ye are holy martyrs crowned.

Everybody must feel that a direct loss of strength is caused here by the compression of the last two lines into one. It would be easy to criticize individual passages; one can hardly compare any stanza of the English with the original without noting some loss; for instance, when Alda goes to ask of the King where is Roland, her betrothed, Karl says:—

Soer, cher' amie, de hume mort me demandes,
Jo t'en durrai mult esforcet exchange;
Ço est Loewis miez ne sai à parler,
Il est mes filz e si tendrat mas marches.

This passage seems very inadequately rendered by—

"Dear Sister, gentle friend," he said,
"Thou seekest one who lieth dead.
I plight to thee my son instead—
Louis, who lord of my realm shall be."

It is not, however, fair to judge of a translation by detached passages. We are bound to say that the result, as a whole, is satisfactory. We have here for the first time an English version of this noble poem; it is so far an adequate version that it preserves in the main the spirit of the original, and carries us away to the strange old time when the "middle ages" were as yet only beginning. It will serve as a guide to the beginner in early French literature, and will be read with pleasure and profit by those who have not the time or the inclination to embark in that delightful study.

It remains to be said that the disaster of Roncesvalles is historical. Here, in the year 778, Karl lost the rearguard of his army, Roland Hruotlandus, Prefect of the March of Brittany, being killed among them by an attack of Basques, not Mohammedans; thirty years later an army under Louis le Débonnaire was cut to pieces in the same place, and in five years afterwards another French army was defeated in a gorge of the Pyrenees by these savage mountaineers. A threefold disaster of this kind could not but impress profoundly the mind of France. This impression is described in the *Chanson* in a passage as poetical, and perhaps as well translated, as any in the whole poem:—

Now a wondrous storm o'er France hath passed,
With thunder-stroke and whirlwind's blast;
Rain unmeasured, and hail, there came,
Sharp and sudden the lightning's flame;
And an earthquake ran—the sooth I say,
From Besançon city to Wissant Bay;

From Saint Michael's Mount to thy shrine, Cologne,
House unfrited was there none.
And a darkness spread in the noontide high—
No light, save gleams from the cloven sky.
On all who saw came a mighty fear.
They said, "The end of the world is near."
Alas, they spake but with idle breath,—
'Tis the great lament for Roland's death.

Dread are the omens and fierce the storm,
Over France the signs and wonders swarm:
From noonday on to the vesper hour,
Night and darkness alone have power;
Nor sun nor moon one ray doth shed,
Who sees it ranks him among the dead.
Well may they suffer such pain and woe,
When Roland, captain of all, lies low.
Never on earth hath his fellow been,
To slay the heathen or realms to win.

THE DUKE OF ALBANY'S HIGHLANDERS.*

THERE is one additional objection to the stupid practice of publishing novels in three volumes which we have never seen mentioned, but which is worth consideration—the circulating library subscriber's grievance. A person in the country subscribes to Mudie's at a rate which entitles him to get so many volumes at a time. Three of these volumes may turn out to be substantial and separate octavos, each affording a good deal of reading, and so giving the subscriber a fair return for his money, at any rate in quantity; but the three volumes may be those of a novel such as the one now before us, printed in very large type, and with a very wide margin, and containing only as many words as, if printed in a reasonable way, would make a very small octavo. Three volumes of this sort may be read with ease, in one sense, in a couple of hours. Then the subscriber has all the trouble and expense of returning his box and changing the books. Printed on the same scale, a book such as *The River of Golden Sand* or *Senior's Conversations*—to take two books much in request just now—would run out into about fifteen volumes each, which the subscriber would have to get down in successive batches. It must be difficult to find an adequate reason for maintaining this exceptional practice with regard to novels, which would at once be seen to be absurd if applied to any other class of books. It may be urged that many novels would not pay for publication unless printed in this expensive form, to which the obvious reply is that it would be an undiluted benefit if the greater number of novels now published were suppressed. These works cost the libraries about six shillings a volume, and perhaps, in the present state of the book trade, it might be difficult to replace them by other books as cheap. What the circulating library requires is a certain number of volumes to circulate, and novels are, on the whole, cheaper per volume than anything else. But this view leaves out of count the room for expansion which the book trade offers if intelligently worked. The amount of business which the circulating libraries do is quite trifling compared with what they might probably do by a better system, inviting a larger circle of subscribers by giving the subscriber more for his money. Readers, authors, and publishers would all gain by the change. As Mr. Matthew Arnold lately urged, there is a great future before authors—that is, authors who deserve to have a future—if the cost of books can be reduced to the reading public; but one class of books will be extinguished—namely, the fatuous novel. The good novel should prosper. To which category the novel we now have on hand belongs may be gathered from the following analysis of its contents.

The Earl of Abercainie has two daughters, one exquisitely beautiful, but silly in proportion; the other magnificently handsome, but a devil in petticoats. The one is beloved by Charlie Oliphant, the other by Captain Duncan Daljoroch, officers of the 72nd Highlanders. The London season is not over, but the Earl and his daughters are at Abercainie Castle, for "certain cogent reasons"—namely, that the Earl is desperately in debt and in fear of arrest, from which we are to infer that he is not a representative peer. Abercainie is near Stirling, where the officers are quartered, and the Earl rides out with one daughter and the Captain, leaving the other daughter alone at home when the subaltern comes to call; the Earl, who is described elsewhere as a dragon of strictness, being in the habit of allowing his daughters when alone to receive visitors from the barracks, who, for their part, as appears from mention of their clanking spurs and jingling swords, seem to have been in the habit of riding about the country in uniform. Although the Earl is in such desperate straits for money, he still has his little comforts about him. "The room in which they sat"—the Lady Auriel and the Lieutenant—"though its fittings might be excelled by those of many another mansion in the country, by its aspect"—apparently an east one—"might well dash the confidence of a penniless lover. It showed masterpieces of art in cabinets, lounges, and enamels, and more than one exquisitely tender Greuze, and striking Boucher, peeping out between the rich hangings. . . . A *jardinière* with rare exotics stood in the deep recess of the centre window, and on a pedestal of Rosso antico, were Louis XV. and Madame de Pompadour dancing a minuet, worth many more guineas than Charlie ever possessed at once in his life." From which it may be gathered that the

* *The Duke of Albany's Own Highlanders*. A Novel. By James Grant, Author of "The Romance of War." London: Routledge & Sons. 1880.

Earl, notwithstanding his difficulties, had not hit on the obvious remedy against the threatened visit from the bailiffs, of which he was in daily expectation, by sending some of these costly articles to Christie and Manson. However, the room was a pretty one for making love in, and the charming Lady Auriel, like many another high-born damsel, knew how to put a lover at his ease, for she opened the conversation by saying, "I wonder you don't prefer the cavalry. You have seen my cousin Sidney in his Hussar uniform, and is it not handsome?" The tact and good taste which dictated this pretty speech to an officer of "the Feet" are just what might be expected from a girl who is as charming as beautiful. But the lover replies that his fortune gives him no choice, stoutly adding, "So far as costume is concerned, I think that the combination of the British uniform with the garb of old Gaul makes the most striking dress in the armies of Europe." However, although she can say pert things, the young lady can also encourage her lover, for she has a soul equally above money and good sense. But the Earl's daughters are made to understand by their father that they must marry for money, and the haughty Lady Augusta accepts the *parvenu* Captain Daljoroch, who apparently agrees to pay off the Earl's debts in consideration of the honour; the lady going through the business of accepting her lover in the style of the villain in a melodrama, who gnashes his teeth, and says, "But I must dissemble"; Captain Daljoroch, who is described as a shrewd man of the world, behaving throughout like a perfect simpleton. Charlie, not being, like the Captain, a man of enormous wealth, is snubbed by the Earl, and goes off to join his regiment in India. The troop ship in which he sails appears on this occasion to have taken out a miscellaneous assortment of passengers, amongst others a Parsee merchant, and picks up by the way an Afghan prince in disguise, wandering about the ocean on a raft, who forthwith takes service as Charlie's bearer. But a still more wonderful incident is the pursuit of the vessel by a shark, which, regardless of the danger of getting caught in the screw, keeps in the wake of the steamer until caught by the sailors. Charlie joins his regiment just in time to take part in the Afghan campaign, the 72nd forming part of General Roberts's force which carried the position of the Peiwar Kotal, of which exploit we have here a new and perfectly original account. A writer the other day suggested that, if we would only take Herat, England would soon do a splendid trade in pistachio nuts; but our author here goes further, for he makes the officers of the 72nd enjoy "a jar of Cabul wine" for their evening meal, the wine "flavoured so like Madeira that you can scarcely know the difference." Why not, when you are about it, have made our gallant sailors take part in the affair, and describe the position of the Peiwar Kotal as carried by a bombardment of British gunboats? The Afghan prince lately cruising about the Arabian sea on a raft, and afterwards Charlie's runaway servant, now of course comes out strong; he is in and out of the British camp, like Cerberus, three gentlemen at once, suborning our Mussulman Sepoys by means of "mantras," which is as if one were to lead Dr. Cumming about by dangling a photograph of the Pope before him. In one sense our author is only too conventional, as when he says that "the artillery got ably into position at 3,000 yards range, and a terrible exchange of round shot and shell took place almost the entire day. But, singular to say, the attacking party met with scarcely a casualty; and during an eight hours' fire our artillery only paused at intervals to cool their guns." The advance of the 8th Foot is described as taking place:—

Colours advanced and bayonets fixed—point over point, and flashing in the sun. Many rolled clattering down, killed or wounded, into the chasm. Pith helmets falling one way and rifles another—some retaining the latter with a tenacious grasp; but a wild cheer announced in a moment more that the place was won. For the attack had been made by the bayonet—the grand old British weapon that never fails.

As well describe a man driving a four-in-hand up Snowdon as a column marching up the Peiwar Kotal with bayonets fixed "point over point." As a matter of fact, not a bayonet was fixed on the occasion, nor was the position carried by that grand old weapon, for the excellent reason that the storming described never took place, the ridge having been abandoned by the Afghans before the 8th Foot got there. We believe it is correct to say that the gallant regiment did not sustain a single casualty on this occasion.

Charlie, who was with another part of the force, escapes unhurt from the scene of carnage to lose himself the next day, and in his efforts to find the British columns, he goes through a number of surprising adventures, in which a certain Afghan is always appearing ubiquitously, no matter where Charlie may be going, and is always getting shot by Charlie or knocked over by him, or trampled upon by Charlie's horse, yet always turning up in a ravine or nullah next day to take vengeance on Charlie, still wandering about in search of General Roberts's force. Imagine a person put down in Hyde Park and spending several days trying to find the Wellington statue, and you have some idea of the difficulty of finding Roberts's force in the Koorum Valley. But Afghans were not the only sources of danger in that country. An unmistakable sound of growling and crunching among the jungle was followed by the appearance of a couple of wolves rending a dead horse, a sight so appalling that Oliphant had scarcely need to put the spur to the animal he rode. Naturally, the episode made the wanderer more than ever anxious to see "the white tents of General Roberts's camp"; Indian wolves gorged with food being notoriously disposed to attack a man on horseback. But there are creatures more

terrible than even wolves in those parts. As Charlie was bivouacking out, "more than once the odious cry of the jackal rang out upon the night, and made him start and grasp his revolver." Had Charlie been stationed at Calcutta he would have had a bad time of it, for the jackals are much more common there than in Afghanistan. And, while the author is piling up horrors, it is a pity he did not say something about the rats and the fleas, both of which are more commonly met with in the Koorum Valley than jackals or even wolves. However, escaping both wolves and jackals, Charlie next morning is waylaid by a party of "Khels" as he is about to cross a ford, still in his search for Roberts's column. "Rabbi l'alamina," exclaimed one—"of the Khels"—joyously, using that tremendous first word of the first chapter of the Koran, and proceeds with the others to take Charlie prisoner, first firing away several rounds of ammunition at him. Charlie, however, is rescued from death by Ferrozodeen Khan, the Afghan prince, late Charlie's bearer, and ex-navigator of the Arabian Sea, already referred to, who carries him off to his own home, and sets his two wives to wait on the visitor, as is the custom of Afghans. It only wants that the ladies should be described as driving about Cabul in a Victoria, and giving a five-o'clock drum, to make the tale a perfect picture of Afghan manners. And Charlie, who, although fresh from England, finds not the smallest difficulty in conversing in the Pushtoo language, is made furious love to by one of the wives, presently strangled by her husband—Charlie witnessing the murder calmly, and raising no difficulty. Eventually Charlie escapes from his prison, as was only to be expected, and at last does find his way to Roberts's camp, where his adventures naturally excite a good deal of astonishment. He has now been shot at, stabbed at, ridden at, ambushed at, and generally so hair-breadthly escaped, that it is hardly fair, when he does get back to Roberts's camp, to finish him off by the unromantic, if original process, of being trampled upon by a commissariat elephant gone "must." Not, however, that he is killed even now; Charlie has as many lives as a cat, or the Afghan prince above referred to, and although the "infuriated animal seized him up in his trunk and dashed him with violence to the ground, and . . . taking up the body of Charlie, who was quite senseless now, hurled it among a crowd of camp-followers," Charlie managed to get round, although considerably shaken, and returned home to find that the Lady Auriel had just married a certain Sir John Lennel, who appears to have been an excellent person and a kind husband, but whose interference made his visit to England disappointing to Charlie. If you are to go in for this sort of thing, it is as well to be amusing, which we cannot say we have found this book. On the whole, we prefer our old friend Baron Munchausen.

HISTORY OF RUSSIA.*

IN spite of the recently awakened interest in the Russian Empire—an interest very genuine, if rather hostile—the ignorance as to Russian history is almost as general as ever. Every one can read French, and many people can read German, yet such standard books as the French translation of Karamsin, the great national historian, Schnitzler's *L'Empire des Tsars*, Rambaud's various works on Russian history, Bernhardt's *Geschichte Russlands*, and many more, are unknown names to ninety-nine out of every hundred cultivated Englishmen. Of course it may be said that laziness and disinclination to move out of a prescribed groove of reading are at the bottom of this ignorance; that to read a book in a foreign language, however familiar it may be, is always more of an effort than to glance over a work in one's native tongue. It is not so easy to take the sense in with half an eye, mental as well as physical, keeping up a conversation perhaps the while, on the comparative merits of the French and Dutch plays, on of the superiority of the new to the old Government. Then, again, many people's idea of studying history is to slide gently from one proper name to another, each of these names calling up the events connected with it. Thus a man may have his memory refreshed as to a certain episode by merely seeing "Elizabeth," "Essex," "Bacon," "Raleigh," before him on the page; but how if the names happen to be "Alexis," "Nicon," "Morozof"? Whatever we may choose to assign as the reason, the fact remains that the public are ignorant, and choose to be ignorant, of the history of Russia. Mr. Mackenzie Wallace has done his best to awaken an interest in its customs and institutions, and Mr. Ralston has given us an admirable account of the welding together of all the many elements until the Russian nation was formed; but there is still room for a short connected account of the Russians from the earliest times up to the present day, and this Mr. Gossip has endeavoured to supply in the little book before us. In some respects he has done his work well. He has taken great pains to have his facts correct, and he has sketched a plan for himself which, if he had carried it out, would have developed into an admirable history. Unfortunately it is easier to sketch plans than to execute them. There is a want of proportion in his way of treating his subjects that is fatal when he is dealing with things which are not perfectly familiar; and his facts, though correct in themselves, occasionally become, by a false relation with what has gone before, either dwarfed or exaggerated. For instance, he

* *History of Russia*. By R. Gossip, Author of "Turkey and Russia; their Races, History, and Wars." Glasgow and London: Collins & Sons.

devotes seven pages to the history of the first false Dmitri, while he is silent as to the great part played by the Lithuanian princes of the fourteenth century, in whose hands Kief, the mother of Russian cities, remained for four hundred years. He is diffuse about Ivan IV., as to whose existence English readers generally have some faint glimmerings of consciousness; but he rather alludes than refers to the struggle in which Ivan III. crushed the republican spirit of Novgorod, and put down the system of appanages which had been the ruin of the country since the days of Vladimir. Mr. Gossip is at his best when he is giving an account of institutions and reforms. These require to be stated clearly and briefly, and Mr. Gossip states them well. He has succeeded in conveying a just notion of Jaroslaf's laws and of Vladimir Monomachus's advice to his children. He has summed up in a few words the reforms of Alexander II., though it would have been better if the words had been shorter and easier for the "young students," for whom the book is specially written, to understand. In style, however, Mr. Gossip often fails. In his anxiety to be picturesque, he sometimes descends into personal details that could readily be spared in a book which aims at brevity. For instance, in the account (p. 199) of the revolution on the accession of Nicholas, he says:—"The noise of the artillery so frightened his wife, a daughter of the heroic Queen Louise of Prussia" (this is rather a curious antithesis), "that she contracted a nervous twitching of the face which endured through life." Fortunately this sad personal defect was not the only result of the conspiracy. Many of the men who suffered for their part in it were advocates of the new ideas of social regeneration and liberty, and their deaths only caused the opinions they had cherished to strike deeper root into the heart of new Russia.

Mr. Gossip also errs in the elaborately quaint expressions in which he sometimes indulges. He has a special fondness for the word "coy." In p. 35 he enlarges on the "coy denials" of Vladimir Monomachus, when pressed to be ruler over Russia; while he remarks in p. 79 that "the reluctance which Boris showed" (on a similar occasion) "was but a piece of coy dissimulation." This is as affected as it is untrue to fact. Boris's apparent disinclination to succeed his brother-in-law Feodor as Tsar was due to the policy which governed all his conduct. He was far too wise a man, and too cognizant of the temper of the people, to appear to grasp at a throne which should have belonged to the murdered Dmitri. He was well aware of the widespread belief that he himself was the murderer, and that there were also some who did not scruple to impute to him the death of Feodor also. So Boris bided his time, and rejected the prayers of the Patriarch, boyards, and citizens of Moscow, and not until the nation came forward and hailed him Tsar did he consent to wear the crown of Jaroslaf. In the instances we have quoted Mr. Gossip's affectation has given a false impression both of the men and of their time, but sometimes his archaisms are merely meaningless. To say (p. 97) that "when King Sigismund died he (Mikhail) concealed himself that he had found his chance," is bad English, but does not mislead as to facts. To disguise the death of Boris under the elegant phrase that he was "removed" is silly, but it is nothing more; but the remark about Peter II. (p. 140) that he "reiled from the marriage into the promise of which he now conceived himself to have been trepanned" is only to be understood by an ingenious process of guessing.

Mr. Gossip deserves great praise for the careful way in which he has collected his materials, and his statements of facts are, as we have before said, generally to be relied on. Only once or twice has he made a slip, and these slips are comparatively unimportant. In case, however, the book should run into a second edition, it may be as well to point them out, so that they can be corrected. In p. 30, after alluding to the murders committed by Sviatopolk, Vladimir's step-son, Mr. Gossip suddenly takes to calling him "Sviatoslaf" and does so four times in the same page. The confusion likely to arise from this is all the greater as Vladimir had a son Sviatoslaf, prince of the Drevlians, who was himself one of the victims of Sviatopolk. In p. 98 he remarks that "Alexis's minister Morozof induced the young Tsar to wed his wife's sister." Now Alexis was already married to Maria Ilinitchna when Morozof, who was a man of original views, decided that, instead of persistently plotting against the Tsarina, as had formerly been the custom of the Ministers, he would make himself one with the Tsar by becoming his brother-in-law. While speaking of Alexis we may observe that Mr. Gossip has made a most serious omission in his silence about the Patriarch Nicon and his reform of the liturgy. To be sure he gives a short sketch of the matter at the end of the book, but what would English readers think of a sketch of Charles I.'s reign in which there was no mention of Laud? Some reference should certainly be made to the struggle between the old and the new, though it need not be enlarged upon till the author comes to write about the Russian Church. Again, he is in error as to the attitude of the nobles in the question of the freedom of the serfs, raised by Alexander II. It is quite true that they looked on the measure with disfavour, and opposed it as long as they thought that their opposition had weight; but, at last, seeing that the cause of freedom would finally triumph, many of them gave in, and in 1857 the nobles in the provinces of Podolia, Kief, and Volhynia took the initiative, and offered to free the serfs belonging to them. Mr. Gossip is also a little hazy in his dates about the marriage of Catherine and Peter. He says (p. 119), "entering the palace as a mistress, she soon ruled it as a wife." Catherine did not marry

Peter till six years after she first went to live with him, and the marriage was not avowed for four years after that, when her high-spirited conduct at the Pruth had gained her the admiration of the army. She was married privately, that is, in 1708, and was acknowledged Tsarina in 1712.

Mr. Gossip has a strange disinclination to mention female names. He reminds one indeed of the primitive men whom custom forbade to speak the name of any woman. In cases where it is more convenient, and certainly more interesting, to form a distinct conception of a lady, in which her name goes for a good deal, we are put off with such descriptions as, his "eldest son married a daughter of the Saxon Harold," "his wife, the sister of Boris," "his morganatic wife, a Polish lady." This is being "*la femme de son mari*" with a vengeance, and it may be questioned if notoriety of this sort would have been acceptable to these ladies. The reader with an inquiring mind is therefore left to hunt wearily till he can ascertain that Harold's daughter, wife of Vladimir Monomachus, was called Gytha, that Feodor's wife was named Irene, and that the morganatic wife of Constantine was Antonia, Princess of Lovicz, for whose sake he resigned the crown of Russia. If Mr. Gossip has reasons of his own for withholding this information, will he not append some tables for the benefit of those readers who find a joy in genealogy?

But all Mr. Gossip's sins and shortcomings are light compared with those in the matter of orthography. We have made a list of errors so long that, if they were all to be noticed, one article would hardly suffice to enumerate them. It is not that he does not spell the Russian names after this or that manner, that he puts two *ff*'s instead of one, or uses an *s* instead of a *c*. Russian orthography is very undecided in these respects, and a good deal of latitude may be allowed. But Mr. Gossip seems to be unacquainted with the rudiments of the Russian language, and consequently often makes nonsense of words which have a distinct meaning. For example, in p. 102, he says the Cossacks of the Dnieper "were joined spontaneously by their brethren the Zaporofskian Cossacks." Now this is nonsense, for the word which he renders Zaporofskian is really Zaporogian, signifying "beyond the *porogs* or cataracts of the Dnieper," where these Cossacks had a wide tract of land. In p. 44 he says the Tatars kept up the distinction of *Veliki Kneiz*, or Grand Prince, when the Russian word for prince is spelt *kniaz*; in p. 91 he alludes to the part of Moscow called "*Bely-Gorod*," or the white town, misspelling the first word, which should be "Biel." There are other examples of the same kind, but we have not time to quote them. Many of the commonest names are also printed most carelessly, and without any definite plan. This may be the fault of the printer quite as much as of the author; but, however that may be, no book should be presented to the public in the condition of this one. In p. 40 "*Riazan*" is spelt "*Raizan*," in p. 46 Lake "*Peipus*" is called "*Pepius*," on p. 48 "*Usbeck*" is spoken of as "*Usback*," and in the next page "*Bestujef Riumin*" is transformed into "*Riamin*." In the reign of Elizabeth the Chancellor Bestujef Riumin is always alluded to as "*Bestuchoff*." In p. 61 "*voievode*" is written "*voyrod*," and in p. 69 the Tsarevitch is twice called "*Tsarovitch*." This of course comes from the usual English pronunciation, in which the "*o*" is made short, and there is therefore hardly any audible distinction between it and a short "*e*." In p. 93 Pojarsky, the liberator of Russia from the Poles, is spelt "*Pojorsky*," in p. 102 Dolgorouki is twice called Dalgorouki, and in p. 124 Lewenhaupt, the general, appears as Lewenhauft. Cheremetief is hardly recognizable as "*Scherematoff*," nor does Catherine II.'s native country fare much better as "*Anhalt Zerbert*." One regrets that the great Cossack Pougatchef should be introduced to "young students" under the disguise of "*Pougatelloff*," nor is one disposed to abandon the final "*p*" of "*Perekop*" in favour of an "*f*." It is hardly necessary to increase the harshness of the Russian names by inserting more "*rs*," as Mr. Gossip has done in the case of Souvoroff, whom he calls (p. 170) "*Surwaroff*." "*Kinburn*" is a very English name, so we must not be surprised if Mr. Gossip has twice written it as "*Kilburn*." The powerful Zoubof family might commit crimes undetected disguised as "*Duboff*," but we wonder that the great French financier should rest quietly in his grave and hear himself handed down to posterity as Thurgott. In the account of the conspiracy on the accession of Nicholas one victim is systematically spoken of as "*Ryclieff*," which after much thought we guessed to be a free translation of "*Ryleef*." The Polish Marquis Vielepolski has his second "*e*" changed into an "*o*."—Mr. Gossip is fond of "*o*'s"—and in the very last page of the book we are overwhelmed with a crushing quotation from a German called "*Fuerbach*." Considering that people look upon any mistake in spelling their names as the most deadly of all insults, and considering also the present irritable state of mind of the Russians towards the English, it is quite lamentable to think how many additional enemies this short work will gain for us in the descendants of those gentlemen whose names have been so grievously maltreated.

AGUSTIN DE ROJAS.*

AGUSTIN DE ROJAS (or Roxas) was by nature and education a *picaro*. This personage, whom we are very loth to translate

* *El Viage Entretenido de Agustin de Roxas, natural de la villa de Madrid, con una exposicion de los nombres historicos y poeticos que no van declarados.* Quinta edicion, corregida y emendada segun el expurgatorio del año 1747. Con Licencia en Madrid. Por Don Benito Cano, año de 1793.

into "rogue," was the stock hero of the Spanish novels of the seventeenth century, and figured on the contemporary stage as buffoon. Like most of the characters of Spanish light literature, he was conventional, and early became fixed into a type which varied little, if at all, from first to last. The action has always been more interesting to the Spaniard than the actor. It is true that in the course of his career, which lasted some century or so in his native country, the *pícaro* became bitter and cynical, rather than merely scampish, as he had been at first, the Inquisition and the Count Duke of Olivares working admirably together to sour men's humour; but at bottom the type varied little. The *pícaro* remained very much what he had been on his first appearance, till Holy Church finally banished him, with Jews, heretics, and other unclean persons, into France and England. We know him as Gil Blas, Colonel Jack, Ferdinand Count Fathom, or even as Roderick Random, and are not tired of him yet, though he has ceased to excite any sympathy in his own country; but we regard him, very properly, as an ingenious puppet, invented for dramatic purposes rather than as a portrait of anything in life. He had his original, however. He must necessarily have answered to something in real life, or he would scarcely have met with the immediate and enthusiastic reception that he did. The best definition of him is that he was the Pizarro or Cortes of common life—a pushing fellow, resolved to see the world and make his fortune, and far from scrupulous how he did it; preferring to cheat, though able to fight at a pinch; not incapable, however, of friendship or gratitude, and endowed with a vast faculty for moralizing. When he has conquered his vulgar Mexico, he will build churches and live cleanly, if he does not parody the death of the other conqueror, and die murdered by his accomplices, or sadly serving his Majesty in the capacity of galley slave. In an age in which the pike and the pen were the only tools presented to the Spaniard's choice, the *pícaro* had his representatives in letters as well as in arms, and the foremost of these was the author of the *Viage Entretenido*, the Amused and Amusing Journey.

Whether Agustin de Rojas ended his troubled career in the galleys is not known. His last appearance is in the character of lawyer and author of a work on the Good Republic, which the Inquisition put into the Index Expurgatorius, and posterity into the index of the unreadable. Before this fatal fall into dull respectability he had not only sown his wild oats, but written a history of the process. This work, the *Viage Entretenido*, appeared in 1603, and was several times reprinted in the course of the next ninety years. At the time of its publication, and apparently for some years before, the author was following the profession of actor, which in Spain in these days included that of playwright. Although he was barely six-and-twenty, he had already a vast vagabond experience. In his preface he asks whether even Guzman de Alfarache, who had issued from the press, some four years before, or Lazarillo de Tormes, the founder of the great *pícaro* line, had had more masters or been in more scrapes than he. In unconsciously biblical language he declared that he had been more rolled about in the world than a wheel—the wheel he names being the familiar "azuda" or Moorish water-wheel of Toledo, elsewhere in Spain called a "noria." And if we are to trust his facts, the comparison is just. Though a gentleman by birth, an Hidalgo free from stain of Jewish or Moorish blood, he was born in a condition which he has chosen to leave in obscurity. Like Lope de Vega or Sta Teresa, he was early urged by his roaming instincts to leave the quiet of home; but there were no officious relations to cross his wishes, and he began life as page to some other penniless Hidalgo then trailing a pike in Flanders. The heroic days of the Low Country wars were over before Rojas came to serve in them. There was still fierce fighting to be done and plunder to be got, but they bore no proportion to the starving and shivering to be gone through. The pay was for ever in arrear, the commissariat was stupendously bad, the country produced no wine—frequently indeed there was nothing better to drink than the more liquid kinds of mud. By the age of seventeen the future actor had seen enough of war. He found his way back to Spain in the suite of some general officer, and betook himself to the kind of life which Spaniards call "living by miracle." The details of this life he gives in the most general possible manner, but he seems to have starved, robbed, begged, and been happy. Finally he drifted on to the stage, which had now become the El Dorado of young Spain. What time he can have found to learn anything but the ways of the world in the course of these few and busy years it is hard to see; but he had certainly picked up a good deal of the classical commonplace then fashionable in literature, some Latin, a great amount of undigested general information, and a remarkably terse and lively Castilian style. His Journey is full of "loas"—that is, long prologues written by himself to flatter the audience and put them in a good humour for the comedy. These prologues were to the old Spanish stage what the introductory farce is to ours, and Rojas's productions are perhaps the best specimens of their kind.

But if the *Viage Entretenido* contained nothing beyond the personal adventures of Agustin de Rojas, it might be left to sleep in peace with Marcos de Obregon or the *Picara Justina*. It would certainly not be cited as an authority by every writer on the Spanish stage. Fortunately the inquiring spirit of the writer led him to collect all the information he could about his own profession, and the growing interest of the public in matters theatrical encouraged him to pour it all out in his book. The forms in which he has given it are singularly happy. Putting aside a certain amount of padding, consisting of

episodes after the manner of the old gentleman Tom Jones met in the wood, and lumps of undigested guide-book about the various towns named in the course of the journey, which make excellent skip, the *Viage* may be divided into two equally interesting parts. In the first place there is the framework—the "amusing" conversations of the four actors, who are, so to speak, the heroes. Then there are the *loas*. The conversations are carried on by four persons; Rojas himself, and his friends Rios, Solano, and Ramirez, all known names of actors of that time, according to Nicholas Antonio. The great subject of their talk when they are not patiently undergoing instruction in history and geography from Rojas is naturally their own profession. The discussions are held as they are on the tramp from town to town in advance of the rest of the company; and the writer shows considerable skill in introducing his subjects appositely. The repetition, too, of the *loas* is generally suggested by some observation of one of the four interlocutors. A complaint of the lawless habits of the people of Seville, made by one of the four, reminds Rojas of a *loa* which he wrote to induce the playgoers of that city to pay at the door. This, it seems, the more high-spirited of them had been wont to consider a slavish submission, and they had accordingly preferred to force admittance, a custom which led to brawling and stabbing, for which the authorities held the players responsible.

The picture which *loas* and talk alike give of the actor's life is certainly not without its lights. We find occasional mention of their popularity with all classes of the Spanish people, made in a way that bears out the truth of Sancho Panza's statements when he was persuading his master not to rush into a conflict with the strolling players of the *auto sacramental*. They were very generally helped when ill luck or their own folly reduced them to begging on the tramp. When Rojas himself was attacked, stabbed, and left for dead in the streets of Seville by some fellow-actors to whom he had refused to give money out of the company's cash-box, he was an object of general sympathy to the whole city. When he recovered, the theatre was crowded with admirers who loudly applauded the *loa* in which he gave a history of his misfortune. But the chief pleasure of their life was derived from their own innate love of freedom and vagabondizing. Rios narrates with relish how he and Solano some years before, in consequence of certain previous adventures not detailed, had been compelled to shift for themselves on a sudden emergency; how at one village they had got good quarters by representing themselves as merchants, had collected entrance-money for a piece they were to give, and had then escaped, leaving an unsettled bill and an unsatisfied audience; and how at another place, having promised to perform the *auto* of Cain and Abel for food and lodging, Solano appeared, with a candle in his hand, as Dios Padre, in a sheet of the landlady's, stained with wine lees. This performance ended unfortunately. Rios, having to kill Solano, who doubled the parts of Abel and the Father, forgot his knife, and, trusting too much to the patience of a rustic audience, took off his beard for the purpose. Hereupon the "banks of galley slaves," as he styles the audience, rose in indignation, and the actors had to fly to escape a cudgelling. After much further wandering, and not a little starvation, they fell in with the strolling company of Martinazos, from whom they obtained food and work. This enterprising manager took advantage of their unlucky position to make them carry his wife in a queen's cradle when the fatigues of the road were too much for her, whereby he economized the hire of a mule.

Rios and Solano, who seem to have been the experienced veterans of the party, impart instruction as well as inspiring tales of adventure to their younger friends. Solano, having had occasion to observe that he had been less even than *farandulero*, for he had been *bojiganga*, is called upon to explain. He then proceeds to set forth, in a speech which contains more information as to the inner life of the old Spanish stage than can anywhere else be found, that there are eight distinct forms of company, each having its recognized position in the theatrical world—namely, the *bululu*, *naque*, *gangarilla*, *cambaleo*, *garnacha*, *bojiganga*, *farandula*, and *compañia*. The description of these different societies is somewhat too wordy, and the distinctions are over-refined, but, on the whole, we find the names answering to really different forms of company. The *bululu* is a single stroller who has to fall back on the sacristan to help him through the little religious plays which were the greater part of his repertory. The *naque* is formed by two men strolling as Rios and Solano had done, from which it appears that the latter had been less even than *bojiganga*. It would be tedious to go through the other companies in detail, more particularly as the distinctions between them are often without a difference, and so we pass at once to the *cambaleo*. This company is marked off clearly from the lower ranks by the fact that one of its members is a woman. From the *cambaleo* we rise through the other companies, which rank according to the number of persons they contain and the proportion of women and boys taking women's parts, till we arrive at the full *compañia*, which is at the top of the tree. This, says Solano, must consist of sixteen persons who act, thirty who feed at the general expense, one who takes the money. "God only," adds the speaker, "knows how much he steals." These distinctions no longer exist in the Spanish theatrical world; they were obviously dying out when Rojas published the *Viage*, but some of the words are even now in use. An inferior actor is still, for instance, called a *farandulero*.

The adventures are narrated and the information given to a

running chorus of grumble. Nicholas Antonio, in the twenty lines or so of his Latin devoted to Rojas, says that "laboriosissime istius vitæ (the actor's to wit) conditionem domesticus testis in publicum produxit," and the continual complaints of the hardships they underwent made by all four speakers in the *Viage* bear him out. Not only is repeated mention made in the conversations of their hard work and hard fare, but in one of his *loas* Agustín himself declares that the life of a slave in Algiers was more supportable. The actor has to be up before the dawn writing and studying. All the morning he is rehearsing, all the afternoon performing; at night, when even the slave may rest, the less lucky actor may be summoned by some man in authority who must not be refused to come and amuse his guests. This last abuse rose to such a height that it had to be finally, not abolished, but limited by law. In another *loa*, the manager of a company, threatened with loss of custom by the sudden appearance of a rival troop, reminds the people that he had presented them with fifty-four new comedies and forty farces in the space of eighteen months. As these pieces were not only rehearsed and acted but written by the actors—whence Rojas's complaint about the studying and writing, and the manager's title of "author"—we can quite understand why Antonio describes their life as very laborious. Yet the attractions of its freedom and constant change proved strong enough to keep it filled with the most spirited youth of Spain during the latter half of the sixteenth and the whole of the seventeenth century. Of this popularity Agustín de Rojas was at once a proof and a cause.

CALENDAR OF STATE PAPERS.*

AMONGST divers excellent rules laid down by the Master of the Rolls for those who undertake to edit State papers is one to the effect that in no case is the Preface, in explanation of the documents calendared, to exceed fifty pages without a written permission. We are glad that in this case the permission has been given. No one, not even a reviewer, can be expected to read every word in a volume of more than six hundred pages, which aims at giving an abstract of more than nineteen hundred State Papers, relating to such vast topics as our American colonies in the reign of Charles II., our colonial possessions in the same hemisphere as distinct from colonies, our West Indian colonies, and our possessions in Africa on the Gold Coast, in the West Indies, and elsewhere. A preface of eighty or more pages is indispensable to convey some outline of the numerous Orders in Council, formal proclamations, reports of Governors, petitions of oppressed individuals, and disputes with the French, Dutch, Spanish, and other nations. The directions of the Master of the Rolls for the treatment of every document strike us as judicious, and they have been faithfully observed. A mere abstract like the ordinary heading of a chapter, would have been tantalizing, deficient, and obscure. To reprint every paper *in extenso* would have been impossible. Accordingly, a middle course has been taken. Formal documents are cut down to a couple of lines. Letters relating to a single subject are catalogued, or rather are abstracted "as briefly as is consistent with correctness." But where they relate to a variety of subjects they have been so analysed that the student may carry away a correct notion of all the contents. Endorsements and dates and the number of the pages are recorded and striking expressions or proverbs are reproduced. And it will be at once admitted that such entries as a warrant to pay Edward Morgan 3,000*l.* to be employed for his Majesty's use in Jamaica, or a pass for Mr. Reid to transport a hundred horses to Barbadoes, are in themselves adequate and complete. But reports on the climate and soil of Jamaica, Acadia, and Barbadoes, as well as of the desperate valour shown by soldiers and colonists against the French and Dutch, or of devastating hurricanes and like calamities, demand a much larger space. And it may be fairly said that any one accustomed to deal with official documents will tell at a glance—to use the expression of the Master of the Rolls—not only what is contained, but what is not contained in the originals. A compiler or historian will know exactly what he may expect to find. He will not be sent wandering on fruitless voyages of discovery, and he will only go to the State Paper Office when it is incumbent on him to take nothing at second-hand. The index is methodical and copious, and far the greater portion refers to proper names, though after Jamaica, Boston, St. Christopher, and King Charles—to all of which whole columns are allotted—we have a little space given to such miscellaneous matters as venison, vegetables, bread, and fish.

Such compilations can be opened at any page of the six hundred with both profit and pleasure. Light will be thrown on the legislation, the social habits, the thoughts and expressions, and the spirit of enterprise and adventure that distinguished men of the seventeenth century. Society had just begun to recover from the convulsion of the great Civil War; and whatever may be thought of the manners and morals of the Restoration, this volume affords a convincing proof of the earnest attention which was given by the

Councillors of Charles II. to Plantations and to Charters, to law and justice, to the management of the trade in silk, to the expansion of commerce, and even to the spread of Christianity. The monarch might be feeding his ducks, or toying with Lady Castlemaine and Madam Carwell; but such energetic men as the two Lords Willoughby were in succession governing Barbadoes; John Locke, as secretary to Lord Shaftesbury, was endorsing, annotating, and framing State Papers; and Robert Boyle, with some of the worthiest names in England to back him, was the first Governor of the Company for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England and the parts adjacent.

It is no easy task to convey in two or three columns a correct idea of old papers fully as interesting as the report of a modern Consul in Eastern Roumelia, or a despatch from a mission which had just succeeded in reaching Khoten and Yarkand. But we should be inclined generally to describe this bulky volume as follows. There are, first, Orders in Council sending out Governors, prescribing the course of legislation, defining the extent of executive authority, and giving directions for the redress of grievances. Then come the reports of Governors dilating on the beauty of the climate, on the abundance of provisions, fish, minerals, and other products, on the bad behaviour of evil-disposed persons, and on the insolent aggressions of the French. We have next petitions from individuals who crave pensions, complain of losses, suggest new and untried fields of enterprise, and indulge in speculations of boundless wealth. There are, besides, papers relating to the scale of salaries and allowances, perquisites, punishments, kidnapping, and other incidents certain to distinguish an age no less conspicuous for bravery and daring than for acts of favouritism, corruption, and downright rascality.

The Quaker, in this volume, seems to have fared no better at the hands of Royalists than, according to Macaulay, he fared at the hands of the Puritans. He had by the latter been "persecuted to the death in New England," and, after the Restoration, he was regarded "as the most despicable of fanatics." He objected to take the oath of supremacy, because his "conscience would not suffer him to swear to any proposition whatever." The consequence was that members of this sect were treated quite differently from ordinary Nonconformists. At Boston, eight-and-twenty Quakers were whipped cruelly "only for coming into that Government." Under another law, of the same town, three persons had their ears cut, and one woman, aged about sixty years, was also whipped. Under two other laws several more were imprisoned, fined, banished, and even put to death. No wonder that they appealed to England, and that the King directed that such persons should be sent home to be dealt with agreeably to their demerits and to "our laws." Once, a master of a ship was bold enough to certify that he had put ashore certain Quakers who had been sentenced to banishment in Barbadoes and Jamaica, "by reason of disasters that had befallen him since they came on board," and because he judged it contrary to the laws of England to transport men without their consent. But others of this sect were ordered to be transported to Jamaica by a warrant to the Lord Chief Justice, "on account of their more than ordinary insolence." Yet, on arrival at that colony they could only expect, as we read in the very next document, to be punished for not appearing in arms on muster days, and for refusing to take oaths or to serve as jurors; while they were also bound to contribute to all taxes, including those for churches and their incumbents. In a report from Governor Endicott, who approaches the King as "your poor Mephibosheth," these unfortunate sectaries are described as open blasphemers, open enemies to Government, and promoters of doctrines tending to subvert Church and State. On the other hand, we find that in New Hampshire, a certain Major Shadleigh was left to settle an unjust matter over which other Commissioners had "sat to no purpose." The writer of this document was of opinion that, though a Quaker and neither taking nor imposing oaths, Shadleigh was unfit for a Governor but quite fit for the employment he had in hand. The whole paragraph, with the acquisition of the title of major, is somewhat mysterious, though paralleled a little further on by Lord Willoughby's allusion to one Colonel Lewis Morris, a severe Quaker, who would astonish a Frenchman by his "thee and thou." The same Colonel is elsewhere described as an unfit man to negotiate with "so airy a people" as the *Monsieurs*, who would take his presence as no small affront. In Barbadoes the Governor, Sir Thomas Modyford, had thought it desirable to employ on some confidential mission to San Domingo a certain John Perrott, a noted Quaker, of good temper, skill, and knowledge in merchant affairs, whose great cunning, searching, and industrious spirit and loyalty to the King must beget confidence. This worthy gentleman was quite content, for his Majesty's service, to appear in a black satin suit with sword and belt, and to be called captain. This partly explains the titles of major and colonel in two preceding extracts, and is a slight set off against the whippings and imprisonments inflicted on a sect that hated episcopacy, and entertained singular views about diversions, forms of speech, dislike of oaths, postures, and dress.

Several of the extracts have reference to ebullitions of political feeling, and especially to the pursuit of two of the regicides, Whalley and Goffe, who figure in New England as Richardson and Stephenson. These two Hectors, as they are termed, were in 1661 daily "buzzing in the ears of the people about a change of Government." They had got the Marshal-General on their side, and though repeated orders were issued for their capture they always managed to elude pursuit. In vain did Governor Endicott

* *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial Series.—America and West Indies.* 1661-1668. Edited by W. Noel Sainsbury, of the Public Record Office. London: Longmans & Co.; Trübner & Co. Oxford: Parker & Co. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. Edinburgh: A. C. Black and Douglas & Foulis. Dublin: A. Thom. 1880.

cott issue instructions to the Governor of Connecticut, to the Deputy Governor of New Haven, to the Governor of Plymouth, to Peter Stuyvesant, Governor of the New Netherlands, and to divers other functionaries to have these rebels apprehended. In vain did one Dennis Scrauton give information that they were hidden in the house of one Davenport, a minister in New Haven; that one Goodman Bishop of the town of Guilford, was able to give the like account; and that Deputy Leete knew quite as much. One John Crown—the name is curious in the pursuit of two regicides—had the audacity to depose that Governor Endicott himself had bade them heartily welcome to New England, and had expressed a wish that more such good men would come over. The two fugitives were even said to have been visited by the principal persons of the town, to have been held in great esteem for their piety and parts, and to have so preached and prayed as to be looked on as men come down from heaven. Of course the Governor denied these allegations as calumnies and trusted to have an opportunity of vindicating himself. Afterwards we are told that Whalley and Goffe were entertained and feasted in every place, though known to be traitors. Indeed, a strong feeling in favour of the Commonwealth seems to have animated these colonists, and to have been proof against every threat that councils and authorities could devise. Except that some cattle were subsequently taken and found to belong to these “arch traitors,” we have no final report of the fate of Whalley and Goffe.

The questions of colonizing the Plantations and of kidnapping men to go there are so closely connected that we must treat them as one and the same. Constant petitions were presented to the King and Council on behalf of merchants and planters, who stated that young people were entrapped and spirited away. Lady Yarborough especially, complained that a poor boy had been stolen by spirits as they were termed, and she begged that outgoing ships might be searched. But there was a contrary account which said that evil-minded persons, taking advantage of this popular belief, enlisted voluntarily, received advances of clothes and money, and then pretended they had been carried away against their will. The remedy proposed was a registry of all passengers, and it was also urged that vagrants, rogues, felons not entitled to benefit of clergy, gipsies, and such like, should be transported to the Plantations to serve, according to their ages, for four or seven years. But this plan evidently did not answer, for we have other reports and memorials praying that well-disposed persons should be sent out, not as servants for a term, but on meat, drink, and wages. The example of the ancient Romans is quoted, for they despatched real colonists and “not your convict gaol birds or riotous persons, robbers before they are sent forth, and at best, idle, and only fit for the mines.” In one aspect “Free-trade” is extravagantly lauded as the life of all colonies, but this advanced doctrine is mysteriously coupled with a wish to go to Guinea for negroes, who fetched at that time from 17*l.* to 19*l.* apiece. The pros and cons of colonization are set out with much exuberance of diction and in the style peculiar to men who were not unaware of grave physical obstacles to success. Newfoundland agreed with all God's creatures, except Jesuits and schismatics; it was the greatest nursery for seamen; and, when trade flourished, could bring in to the nation half a million a year. The inhabitants, however, sadly lacked a minister to christen, bury, and marry them, and they were living like so many brutes. Jamaica had the best building timber and stone in the whole world, and plenty of corn, potatoes, yams, plantains, hogs, fowls, cattle, horses, sheep, fish, turtle, and pasturage. The low grounds were feverish from June to Christmas, but the uplands and hills were as “healthful as Cotsall in England.” This attractive Settlement, we regret to say, had for the Speaker of its Assembly a malicious, beggarly, debauched fellow, who, instead of correcting what was amiss in the old laws, attempted by violent discourses and contrivances to render the past Government oppressive and illegal. Barbadoes had been settled in 1625, and in ten years was brought to such perfection that it exported as many tons of goods as the famous Empires of Mexico and Peru. But it fell off afterwards. Boston was a place of incredible fruitfulness in mines, especially copper, and in fish, and could turn out better salt than France itself. Montserrat was very fertile and well re-settled; Nevis decayed, owing to the wars and hurricanes; St. Vincent, covered with wood and inhabited by Indians and Blacks; St. Lucien, unhealthy, the English who had planted it having nearly all died. We note in our days of rapid intercourse that on one occasion the *Rosebush*, a ship commanded by worthy John Browne, left Jamaica on the 10th of February and arrived in the Downs on the 12th of April following.

Several of the documents are entirely taken up with disputes as to boundaries and possession with the French and other nations, and the editor admits that the geography is intricate and confused. The accounts of fighting at Nevis are both animated and instructive. But we own to a partiality for trivial and petty incidents, for queer grievances, and for strange proposals emanating from individuals. Four thousand pounds of such worthless bread were sent over to Jamaica that in consequence it had to be given to cattle or thrown away. Anthony Langston, formerly an ensign in Prince Maurice's regiment, and afterwards fourteen years in Virginia, mysteriously informs Secretary Bennet that he was drinking at the “Dog” tavern, when a person came and invited him to engage in some design. One Waddington, in like manner, drinking at St. Michel's, Barbadoes, uttered treason in his cups, and was actually sentenced to death. As the petitioner expressed due contrition and his prayer was referred to Sir H. Bennet in England,

we may hope that the capital sentence was remitted. Colonel Morgan complained that in a tedious passage to Barbadoes he had lost his eldest daughter, a lady of great beauty and virtues, and two more of his family, owing to a malign distemper, caused by the “nastiness of the passengers.” A harsh law of Barbadoes condemned a fraudulent debtor to stand in the pillory and have his ears cut off. Sir T. Modyford, Governor of Jamaica, wrote home that old army officers, we presume men of the Commonwealth, from “strict saints had turned the most debauched devils.” Four young men were scourged by the hangman through Edinburgh, burnt in the ear, and then sent to Barbadoes, for abusing James Scott, the minister of Ancrum, during the time of the sermon. Whether the insult was because the offenders revolted against unsound doctrine or the unreasonable length of the discourse does not appear. In a treaty made by Lord Willoughby with several of the “captains” of St. Vincent, whom we take to be the heads of Indian tribes, the following names occur, and they would have perplexed the late Fenimore Cooper. What would that author have made of Nicholas, Aloons, Rebur, Le Suroe, Nay, Wappiya, and the Grand Brabba? These savages appear to have caused less trouble about a treaty than the French at St. Kitts, who played fast and loose on their paroles and were full of quillits. We have no more space for these curiosities of official literature. This bulky instalment is hardly capable of much improvement; and, if it does not enable historians to indulge in the modern practice of alternately whitewashing and blackening eminent characters in history, it sheds a strong light on those national qualities of energy, perseverance, and fitness for supremacy which yielded up our American colonies only to our own flesh and blood, and which as a compensation for that loss gave us dominion over aliens in creed and colour in India.

TROUBLESOME DAUGHTERS.*

MRS. WALFORD, like many another novelist, has suffered from her very success. She began by writing a story that was as clever as it was short. Having made a hit, she was at once promoted to the ranks of those who, whenever they have a tale to tell, always take exactly three volumes in which to tell it. It is a dreary superstition, whether it is on the part of the reading public, or of the proprietors of circulating libraries, or of the publishers, which thus condemns a writer, because she has been clever and brief, to run a great risk of being long and tedious. We heartily wish that some Chancellor of the Exchequer might be found bold enough to put a heavy tax on the third volume of every novel and on the fifth act of every play. We are quite sure that, in the long run, it would be found to benefit authors, libraries, publishers, spectators, and readers alike. The relief to the unhappy critic would be almost beyond measure great if each story could thus be kept within moderate size. No one, we may take it for granted, really likes to be wearied. No one would rather skim three volumes than read steadily through one. It is indeed provoking to see how a writer of Mrs. Walford's cleverness injures her story from the necessity of swelling it out to orthodox proportions. Why could she not have been allowed to make *Troublesome Daughters* just one-third of its size? We are sure that, had she consulted her own inclinations, she would have set before her readers a much smaller and more homely banquet. She could with admirable skill have served up to them a nice little meal, but she is compelled by fashion or destiny to provide them with a monstrous bill of fare. There is in the story before us so much that is good that we are greatly vexed to find it hopelessly mixed up with so much that is bad. The heroine is as charming a young lady as we have come across for many a long day, and the hero is not unworthy of her. Was it likely, we ask Mrs. Walford, that two young people such as these would, as the result of a single misunderstanding, have been kept apart for more than five whole years? We will not be unreasonable. A love-story cannot of course run on quite smoothly. Things must be made for the first half of the book to go a little wrong, in order that the author may be able to fill up the second half by making them go altogether right. We would willingly allow Mrs. Walford, like Penelope, to weave a web solely with the intention of unravelling it. But there must be some limit to this. We have not in these modern days the patience of the suitors of old, and we expect that what used to take ten years shall now be done in one season. We have little doubt that once at least in the present story, if not twice, it was a sore trial to our author not to clear away all the difficulties, and to bring her story to the usual happy end. Even in the state of affairs at the close of the first volume a dozen pages or so would have been quite enough to enable an experienced writer to remove the misunderstanding and to reconcile the lovers. Who does not remember the delightful promptitude with which in the good old times, all on one day, news came of the death of a rich uncle or godfather, the hard heart of a father was softened, a hero became penitent, and a heroine forgiving, while a parson was found in the very nick of time? Captain Evelyn, our hero, had no doubt given our heroine, Miss Kate Newbattle, just cause of offence. He had shown that his standard of integrity was far below hers. But she need not, therefore, have at once burst a blood-vessel, in a lonely cave on a

* *Troublesome Daughters*. By L. B. Walford, Author of “Mr. Smith: a Part of His Life,” “Pauline,” “Cousins,” &c. 3 vols. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons. 1880.

wild sea-coast, with no house near at hand, and with the doctor a very long way off. She might have fainted. He would have run down to the shore and brought up a hat-full of water to dash on her face. She would have recovered consciousness, and in a faint voice have granted him that forgiveness which his contrition proved that he really deserved. We can well believe that Mrs. Walford would have liked only too well to give the story this happy and quick conclusion, had she not been troubled with that cry, hateful to all writers, of "more copy wanted."

We will forgive her, then, for thus letting slip her first chance of delivering both herself and her readers; but why did she allow herself to be talked over into not taking advantage of her next chance? Matters could not possibly have been in a fairer train than they were at the close of the second volume for bringing everything to the happiest conclusion. The heroine had not only recovered from her illness, but did not apparently show any weakness of the lungs. It was clear that she was not intended to go off in a decline, after the fashion of one large class of novels. The hero had been separated from her long enough to punish him for the error into which he had fallen. Matters were so arranged that his return to her home would have afforded a most dramatic scene. He had even fixed the very day on which he was to start, and she was awaiting him with the most forgiving of hearts. The reader, who knows that he has yet another whole volume before him, cannot imagine how the young people are any longer to be kept apart. In fact, he is almost convinced that the last part of the story must be given up to the narrative of their wedded life. When things are in this happy train, the hero gives credence to a miserable piece of slander against the heroine, and starts at once for the seat of some war in the East. For all that the reader can see, he might just as well at the end of the five years have started off to the seat of some other war in the West. We could more easily have forgiven Mrs. Walford for this most needless expansion of her story had she provided us with good company during the hero's absence. Many of her minor characters, however, are as vulgar as they are dull. We wish our female novelists would go to Miss Austen to learn how a lady, when she writes, should deal with vulgar characters. No one could be more utterly vulgar than John Thorpe in *Northanger Abbey*, and yet the description of him is altogether free from vulgarity. He is as mean a man as Mr. Pollaxfen of the story before us. His sister, Isabella, is as mean as Kate Newbattle's sisters, or as Captain Evelyn's mother; but the reader is never overwhelmed with a sense of their meanness. It is kept within due limits, and it is never for one moment used to swell out a volume. Not the least disagreeable character in *Troublesome Daughters* is a French governess; nor are the passages in which she is introduced at all relieved by her broken English or her bad French. Her accent, we are told, was Parisian; but her French, we boldly maintain, would disgrace even her Scotch pupils. It is not only that her accentuation is imperfect. It is not only that she says *assurance*; but she disregards her genders. One young lady she describes as being *une vrai Parisienne*, and another as being *décolleté*. She announces that she herself will be *prudent*, and she says that some one will "go chez Londres toute de suite." The author herself catches this Parisian lady's bad French, for she speaks of one of the characters as being "ami du famille." It is a pleasant contrast to such foolish writing as this when we are taken, as happily we are not unfrequently taken, among the peasantry of Galloway. Mrs. Walford is at her best when she is describing homely people—above all homely Scotch people. There is one great charm in the Scotch stories. The language that the people talk would seem to be still pure and undefiled. It has not yet fallen to the depths of that mongrel tongue in which many of our common people, and most of our novelists, delight. It can, we fear, hardly be the case that the peasantry in Scotland are free from the desire of using big words which are beyond their understanding. There are as yet, however, few signs of such words, if we may trust the stories in which their talk is introduced. None of the Scotch characters in Mrs. Walford's tales speak after the fashion in which we heard a driver of a country fly speak the other day. "I always," he said, "say the same argument, and I always shall say it. It is the farmers as needs to be rectified, and not the landlords." The poor man had this excuse, that for many years he had been, as he told us, a gentleman's servant. Likely enough he had picked up his big words from his master. It is not only, however, the contrast between the talk of the lower classes in the two countries that pleases us. We find a still greater and more pleasant contrast between Mrs. Walford's style as a writer and her style, so to say, as a speaker. Compared with many of her fellow-novelists, indeed, she stands well in point of composition; but yet we will venture to assert that she really writes better English when she is writing Scotch. Her humour, too, of which she has a fair share, has freer play in the dialect of Galloway than in the talk of society; while one or two of her pathetic touches are greatly heightened by the simplicity of the language in which they are given. An old Scotch farmer is drawn with great skill. The heroine at one time sought refuge in his house when her life at home had become more than she could bear. The farmer's daughter was a young lady of some learning, and the two girls in the evening would gaze on the stars through a telescope, and talk about the wonders of the heavens "till the farmer would aver that 'it beat a' to hear them':—

He would listen, at times, with his mouth wide open, and a lurking smile about the corners, betokening incredulity and amusement, not unmingled with derision,—but he never interfered.

If hidden himself to come and have a peep, he dutifully obeyed, resting his hands on his knees, screwing up one eye, and feeling involuntarily for the trigger, as the attitude reminded him of fingering his ancient fire-lock; but he never could see what he was told he ought to see.

They tried to make him understand the relative sizes of Jupiter and our earth—"they always now talked of 'our Earth,' and wrote it with a large E." But the old man used to say, "it's beyont ma. Na, na; I'm ower auld; I canna come Jupiter." They would try him again and again after that, but he had only one answer, "I'm ower auld; I canna come Jupiter." We are reminded of a story that we have heard of an old manufacturer who was present one day when his daughter was receiving a lesson in astronomy from a country schoolmaster. The old father rose up and said, "Why, schoolmaster, you don't mean to tell me that the earth turns round before the sun like a guse (goose) before the fire." Mrs. Comline, the farmer's wife, is even better drawn than her husband, and gives a great charm to the opening chapters, in which she plays a considerable part. She appears from time to time upon the scene, and is always welcomed by the reader, much as he would welcome the fresh breeze, should he on a summer evening pass out of the heated air of a crowded party. The heroine, too, we must not forget, is always charming. There is indeed much that is both wholesome and pleasant in *Troublesome Daughters*; but we must once more express our regret that it has been so greatly spoilt by being mixed with what is as vulgar as it is laboured and dull.

CLASSICAL SCHOOL BOOKS.*

OUT of an inviting batch of school classics we take first Mr. Skrine's Second Georgic, and here we realize how much Mr. Skrine has contrived to say about his author without long and stiff explanations, or elaborate parallels between Virgil and Lucretius. In his introduction he facilitates the young student's power of comprehension of a poet's design to treat, in heroic or blank verse, his fourfold theme of tillage, trees, cattle, and bees; he shows how Columella endorsed Virgil's form of treatment by his poetical book "on gardening" as a supplement; and elucidates the practical wisdom of Mæcenas's suggestion of the Georgics to the poet. Mr. Skrine has recalled us, briefly it is true, but perhaps more lovingly than most recent editors of the Georgics, to their author's art; and he has been very happy in noting both prefatorily and in his brief commentary the proofs of Virgil's hearty love of his subject:—

In return [writes the editor] his *protégés* take him into confidence, and he learns how they think and feel; he sees the docile growths of the woodland exerting themselves to learn the lessons of civilization; he notes the wild tree that has received a fruitful graft wondering at the delightful transformation and preening herself in her new leafage and unfamiliar fruit; he has sympathy with the corn crops "taking heart" after a burst of rain, and even listens to the miserable boast of the chalk and tufa stone that no lands can match them in feeding and housing snakes.

As *propos* of this last allusion, indeed, it should be remembered that an observant scholar and naturalist, Mr. Blackmore, the author of *Lorna Doone*, dissents from Conington and authorities as far back and weighty as Servius, and will not be persuaded that "tophus" and "creta" can be nominatives to "negant." But one or two other examples cited in the foregoing quotation are no matter of doubt; as where the poet exalts the marvels of grafting and transplanting:—

Tamen hæc quoque si quis
Inserat aut scrobibus mandet mutata subactis
Exuerint silvestrem animum, cultuque frequenti
In quascunque voces artes haud tarda sequetur.—49-52.

And the scholar notes that, after once the wild spirit is put off, the trees will learn any lessons to which you invite them as if they were alive and could hear you. Similarly in v. 59, a little below at "Pomaque degenerant sucos oblita priores" is noted "a personifying touch," as Mr. Skrine remarks. "The Tree forgets its cunning as a craftsman might forget the trade secret of his family." There is a happy power of putting things about this editor, as seen in his note (66) on "Herculeaque arbor umbrosa coronæ," where, after stating the legend or myth about Pluto and Leucæ, and Hercules's connexion with it, he points out that the tree is spoken of as if it belonged to the wreath, because the wreath "is the *raison d'être* of the tree, as we might say the yew was the tree of Robin Hood's long-bow." We counsel young readers to lay this book to heart, and read it lovingly in the coming tree-time. So will they realize better such touches of Virgil as the enumeration of the trees of spontaneous growth, which "campos et flumina late Curva tenent," "an artistic touch," says our annotator, "picturing a plain through which the river winds, traceable by the line of willows." See Blackmore's version, "Peopling the rivers and the mazy brook."

Mr. King has made, in his *Select Orations of Cicero*, a faultless selection of Cicero's most famous speeches; and we cannot be wrong

* *P. Vergili Maronis Georgicon. Liber Secundus.* By Rev. J. Skrine, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

Select Orations of Cicero. With English Notes. By J. R. King, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Oriel. Oxford: Clarendon Press Series. 1880.

Introductory Latin Grammar. Leonard Schmitz, LL.D. London and Glasgow: Collins, Sons, & Co., Limited. 1880.

Euripides' Alcestis. With Introduction and Notes. By C. S. Jerram, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Xenophantis Memorabilia Socratis. With Notes and Introduction. By A. R. Cluer, B.A., Balliol College. Oxford: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

New Greek Delectus. By Henry Musgrave Wilkins, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. London: Longman, Green, & Co. 1880.

in touching chiefly on his handling of the First Action against Gaius Verres, because it exhibits Cicero in the character of a public prosecutor, whereas that on the "Imperium Cnæi Pompeii" introduces us to a rather literary than legal speech in the region of politics, and the Pro-Archia is most attractive as a panegyric. The Ninth Philippic will repay the studious reader, and may well be studied in so clear a text, and with such succinct, helpful notes. Our own remarks will be confined to the strong arguments of one who, from his position as Curule Ædile, felt bound to give the people of Rome a different sort of show from that which it was the Ædile's function to give them, the exposure of flagrant and flagitious bribery conducted on a large scale, and by an abandoned and wealth-brazed criminal. It will be well for the reader to have recourse to Long's Verrine volume in the *Bibliotheca Classica*, which often sets sound counsel before us as to doubtful readings, and almost always gives the clearest accounts of legal words and terms. How Cicero thwarted the plots of this provincial "depeculator ærarii" and "prædo juris urbani" becomes amply plain as the oration nears its close, and it will strike the reader that never did orator hit on a happier occasion for stirring onslaught on wholesale corruption, than when all Italy was met at Rome for the triple object "comitiorum, ludorum, censendique," i.e. the registration. How well in c. 8 does he twit the "divisores," or bribe-distributors told off to distribute bribes in the several tribes, and mock the defendant as coming from "a first-rate school of distributors" (*disciplinâ*, denoting ironically the scope of the Verrine philosophy). In the tenth chapter and elsewhere *Junianum consilium* is described as a byword for a corrupt jury, taken from one presided over by C. Junius as Prætor in B.C. 74, which, at the trial of Oppianicus for attempting to poison Cluennius, acquitted the offenders by such open bribery that the phrase passed into a proverb. To so great a precision had the science of bribery progressed that in the thirteenth chapter "discoloribus signis" denotes "ceræ" of different colours, so that each man's vote might be traced home to him, and it might be seen that he had earned his bribe. In c. 14 we prefer Long's reading, "se avarissimi hominis cupiditati satisfacere posse, nocentissimæ victorie non posse," to Klotz and King's *nocentissimæ*. This latter, as Long notes, is but a specious correction, simply needless. In the beginning of c. 15, "Cui loco" would appear to mean "For which topic." But, on the whole, the care evinced on this oration should be a guarantee and encouraging for going through the rest.

Dr. Schmitz's *Elementary Latin Grammar* deserves a longer word than we can spare of it, in such a grouping of school-books, for its excellent chapters on the irregularities of verbs, and the thoughtful and ingenious notes on such compounds of "eo" as "veneo" and "ambio." We can speak well, too, within its range and scope, of the appended syntax, e.g. § 137; the arrangement, for instance, of the syntax of the dative; and what the editor calls the free use of the genitive—e.g. "sceleris purus, solutus operum, &c." It is evident that in all these instances the Doctor's dicta are the result of philosophic inquiry out of proportion to the small work to which he has devoted his leisure.

Mr. Jerram's capital edition of the *Tablet of Cebes*, Lucian's *Vera Historia*, and the like, would be warranty for his thorough editing of so typical a play of Euripides as the *Alceïstis*; and accordingly we find that he has neglected no point either of meet and full prefatory explanation, or of interpretative and searching commentary. Disinclined to accept the play as a purely satiric drama, he adduces proofs of its being at least a pro-satiric play, and wins our credence for the pitting of Death against Apollo as a fair dramatic resort by adducing dramatic impersonations of Kratos and Bia in Æschylus, and Death and the Fool in old English morality plays. Again, his ethical analysis of the character of Alceïstis is excellent, and a just and reasonable clue in pp. xiii.-xiv. is offered to the reader whereby to understand how an Athenian audience would side with Admetus against Phères in their altercation on the score of contempt for old age, and in the spirit of patriotism. In like manner the satiric character of Heracles is traced out and justified. Neither his gluttony nor his stupidity is without excuse, as will be seen by those who study this thoroughly practical preface. Turning to the commentary, we can bear witness to its exactitude and thoroughness. Basing itself on a thorough study of Bishop Monk's notes, a mine of sound scholarship which has given a good foundation to many elder scholars, it nowhere forgets to attach due weight to his time-honoured dicta of scholarship. It explains such passages as *χέρα τοξήρη φρουρεῖς ὀπλίτας* (35) by taking the adjective as proleptic with *ὀπλίτας* and comparing it with (385) *σκοτεινὸν ὄμμα μὲν βαρύνεται*, "my eye is weighed down in darkness," draws due attention to the monostich dialogue (38-63) between Death and Apollo, as appreciable by an Attic audience accustomed to legal word-fence, and parallels the sentiment in 59 by Cardinal Beaufort's passionate apostrophe to Death in Shakespeare's *Second Part of Henry VI.*, iii. 3. Good notes will be found on *κατὰξωμαι ἔξφει* (74) and *χαῖρα . . . τομαῖος* (101), where, however, the reading *χαῖρας τομαῖος* is preferred. In 156, though *πᾶς* for *ὅπας* is confessedly rare, we concur with the editor in accepting *πᾶσα πόλις* as "the whole city," *πόλις* here ranking as a proper noun. In 173, the transitive use of *ἀκλαιοῦσθαι ἀντίκτος* is well illustrated from Od. iv. 493; and in 194, *οὐτὶς ἦν οὕτω κακός*, "none was so vile or mean," is instanced in proof of Euripides's sympathy with slaves; cf. *Med.* 54, *Orest.* 870, &c. A *propos* of suicide, the semi-chorus in 229-30 delivers itself of the sentiment *ἂν ἄξια σφαγῆς ταῦτε, καὶ πλεον ἢ βρόχῳ δέην οὐρανίῳ πελάσται*—i.e. enough to

make one cut one's throat, and more than enough to make one hang oneself; and hereupon Mr. Jerram notes that, though in the *Helen*, 293, stabbing is reckoned more honourable than hanging, here there is no such distinction. He is clearly right, too, in discriminating in 238 the true meaning of *ὀβριε φήσω*, "I will ever maintain," as not i.g. "semper negabo," as it is taken here and at 198 by Monk and others.

We must turn now for a short space to Mr. Cluer's *Memorabilia Socratis* of Xenophon, designed by him to lead the self-educating student, with the due use of his lexicon, to familiarize himself with Greek idiom. Only in revision have the school editions of Kuhner and Breitenbach been consulted, while in derivations the teaching of Curtius has been followed discriminately. A preface strives to clear the credit of the so-called "Sophists" from the reproach of charlatanism and conceit, so wholesally charged against Gorgias Hippias and the rest, and distinguishes between the position of the advanced Sophists and that of Socrates. This also includes a sketch of the trial and death of the latter, Xenophon as well as Plato having preserved his apologia. After this, and as introductory to the text of the first book, we have an essay on the Religious Beliefs of Socrates; the second is introduced by an essay on the Socrates of Xenophon; the third is prefaced by an account of the Cyrenaic and Cynic schools; and the fourth by another essay on the Dialectical method. The first shows Socrates as a religious man, given neither to scepticism nor to superstition, and careful to attend public religious ceremonies. The historian is eloquent concerning his conduct after Arginusæ, and rebuts the charges of his demoralizing the youth of Athens and inspiring contempt for law by citing examples of his life and conduct. He shows, too, how far he was responsible for the two leaders, Critias and Alcibiades, and the faults of their characters—to wit, in setting them an example of *ἀνταρκεία* which they misconstrued and misused. One or two samples may be adduced out of the first pages of the practical usefulness of his cullings from Curtius and other annotators and grammarians—e.g. in p. 14 the note on *οἰκός*; as a locative case—cf. *χαμαί*, *humī*, *domi*, *Romæ* (*Romai*, old form), *Corinthi*, &c., *ibid.* p. 14, the note on *ὅς*, "on the ground that," or "because," and on the force of the verbal adjective *ποιεῖν* and its meaning and uses, Greek and Latin. With regard to *μηδὲν τῶν τοιούτων οἰόμενος δαμνύνειν*, in § 9, a good note shows that *μή* instead of *οὐ* has a subtlety which "escapes any English rendering. It implies here a sort of vagueness—a doubt that any one would really think that the future was in any way affected by Divine Providence. The finer shades of meaning may be best detected by carefully remembering the emphatic character of the other negative particle." Mr. Cluer's volume may be commended as a praiseworthy elucidation of *Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates*, of which it would be impossible to speak more at length within such limits.

In connexion with such sterling examples of Greek prose and poetry it should be enough to note Mr. Wilkins's work and delectus, based on a blending of Parry's Greek Grammar with Abbott and Mansfield's Primer, and Dr. Curtius's *Accidence*. This delectus is exemplary and systematic, and teaches *pari passu* accidence, syntax, and construing-practice, preserving throughout a consistent addiction to Attic Greek, and avoiding at once unusual words and irregular forms. As far as our examination goes, we should say that the teaching of the accidence is ably reconciled and well enunciated, whilst the examples are not wanting either in aptness or life. Take the twentieth miscellaneous passage, which runs as follows:—

Λαβὼν τίς ποτε παρὰ τίνος τῶν γνωρίμων οἶνον χρηστὸν μὲν ὄλγιον δέ, καὶ ἀκούσας ὅτι δεκαετής ἐστὶ, "μικρὸς ἐστὶν ὥς πολλῶν ἐτών" ἔφη.

Turning to the note hereon we find *λαβὼν* is to be rendered "on receiving," and are referred to a note on *λαβομένη* extr. vi. above, anent *χρηστὸν—ὄλγιον τε* we are reminded that the former applies to quality, the latter to quantity. Anglice, "It is very little of its age," is i.g. *μικρὸς ἐστὶν ὥς πολλῶν ἐτών*, and an apt parallel is adduced from Captain Gronow's "Recollections." Lord — was always praising his champagne for its great age, and offering it in very small glasses, when Foote, the actor, remarked, "It is very little of its age."

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 4d., or \$7 58 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, Mr. DAVID JONES, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 4 Trafalgar Square, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 8 Rue Neuve des Capucines.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW Bill of Contents will be forwarded every Friday Evening by post, prepaid, to any Newsagent in Town or Country on application to the Publisher.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.

Now ready, VOLUME XLIX., bound in cloth, price 16s. Cloth Cases for Binding all the Volumes, price 2s. each. Also, Reading Cases, price 2s. 6d. each. May be had at the Office, or through any Bookseller.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,292, July 31, 1880:

- The Candahar Disaster. Turkey.
The Hares and Rabbits Bill. Belgium. The Indian Famine Commission.
The Irish Disturbance Bill. M. Rochefort and the Opportunists.
The Chiltern Hundreds. Mr. Dodson and Vaccination.
Bath Abbey.
A New Committee of Public Safety. Cologne Cathedral.
Steam Launches. Jesuit Theories of Toleration. Impoverished Landlords.
Cricket. Drawings in Black and White.
The Bend Or Case.
Willis-Bund's Selection of Cases from the State Trials.
The Song of Roland. The Duke of Albany's Highlanders. History of Russia.
Agustín de Rojas. Calendar of State Papers. Troublesome Daughters.
Classical School Books.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,291, JULY 24, 1880:

- The Turkish Question—Politics in the Quarterlies—Afghanistan—The Customs and Revenue Bill—Parliament and Westminster Abbey—Foreign Cattle and the Meat Supply—Egypt—Employers' Liability and Insurance—Reading Made Uneasy.
Bere Regis—One More Unfortunate—Pleasures and Pains of Gardening—Naval Accounts—The Republican Fife in a French Country Town—Dr. Tanner's Fast—Metropolitan Bank Dividends—The Opera Season.
Ward's Selections from the English Poets—Indian Reminiscences—Bardsley's Curiousities of Puritan Nomenclature—Lang's Theorist—The Violin Player—Scottish Sport by a Yetman—Les Deux Masques—Weekes's Lectures on Sculpture—Signor Mondalini's Niece—American Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DORÉ'S GREAT WORKS, "CHRIST LEAVING THE PRETORIUM," "CHRIST ENTERING JERUSALEM," and "THE BRAZEN SERPENT," each 33 by 22 feet; with "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Christian Martyrs," &c. at the DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Daily, Ten to Six. 1s.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL and COLLEGE.
OPEN SCHOLARSHIPS.

THREE SCHOLARSHIPS are offered for open competition at St. Bartholomew's Hospital. The Examination will begin September 27.
1. A Scholarship of the value of £130, open to Candidates under Twenty-five years of age, and who have not entered at any Metropolitan Medical School. Subjects of Examination: Botany, Chemistry, Physics, Zoology.
2. A Scholarship of the value of £130, open to Candidates under Twenty years of age. The other conditions and subjects are the same as the above.
3. The Jefferson Exhibition (value £50) open to Candidates who have not entered at any Metropolitan Medical School. Subjects: Mathematics and Latin, and any two following languages at the option of the Candidates, Greek, French, German. The successful Candidates will be required to enter at St. Bartholomew's Hospital.
4. Preliminary Scientific Exhibition. On October 21 there will be an Examination (limited to Students of the Hospital of less than six months' standing) for the above Exhibition, value £50. The subjects are those of the Preliminary Scientific Examination of the London University.
The successful Candidates for the above Four Scholarships are eligible in succeeding years for the Scholarships of the School, viz.: First year three (1) £50, (2) £30, (3) £20; Second year (1) £50; Third and Fourth year (1) £40, (2) £30, (3) £20, and for the several prizes.
For further particulars application may be made, personally or by letter, to the WARDEN of the College, The College, St. Bartholomew's Hospital, E.C.

THE LONDON HOSPITAL and MEDICAL COLLEGE,
Mile-end, E.—THE SESSION 1880–81 will commence on Friday, October 1, 1880.

Four Entrance Scholarships, value £60, £40, £30 and £20, will be offered for Competition at the end of September to new Students. Entries on or before September 20.
Fees for Lectures and Hospital Practice, 50 Guineas in one payment, or 100 Guineas in three instalments.
All Resident and other Hospital Appointments are free.
The Resident Appointments consist of Five House-Physicians, Four House-Surgeons, One Accoucheur; Two Dressers and Two Maternity Pupils also reside in the Hospital.
Special entries may be made for Medical and Surgical practice.
The London Hospital is now in direct communication by rail and tram with all parts of the Metropolis.
MUNRO SCOTT, Warden.

QUEEN'S COLLEGES, IRELAND.—THE PROFESSORSHIP OF MATHEMATICS in the Queen's College, Cork, being about to become vacant, Candidates for that Office are requested to forward their Testimonials to the UNDER-SECRETARY, Dublin Castle, on or before Saturday, the 14th August next, in order that the same may be submitted to His Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant.
The Candidate who may be selected for the above-mentioned Professorship will be required to enter upon his duties on the 22nd of September next.
Dublin Castle, July 27, 1880.

LEAMINGTON COLLEGE.—ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATION, on September 14 and 15.—Address, Rev. Dr. WOOD, College, Leamington, or, after August 1, Craigside, Felixstowe, Ipswich.

RADLEY COLLEGE, ABINGDON.—There will be an ELECTION in December next to FOUR SCHOLARSHIPS, value £20, £30, £30, £20 tenable for Four Years. The Next Term begins Friday, September 17.

MALVERN COLLEGE.

The NEXT TERM will begin on Monday, September 20.

SOMERSETSHIRE COLLEGE, BATH.—The NEXT TERM commences Saturday, September 18.—For Prospectus and other information apply to the HEAD-MASTER.

THE ISLE OF WIGHT COLLEGE.

Head-Master—Rev. F. R. PENTREATH, D.D.
The NEXT TERM commences on Friday, September 17, at Ten A.M., when all Boys are expected to be present.
The system of Education is that of the leading Public Schools.
Boards are received by the Head-Master at the College, and also by Two of the Assistant-Masters at Lotherian House.
Fees for Board and Tuition amount to £30 1s. per annum.
Prospectuses can be obtained from the HEAD-MASTER, and also from J. W. FARDELL, Esq., Hon. Sec., Cambrian House, Ryde.

S. ANDREW'S COLLEGE, CHARDSTOCK, RE-OPENS
September 10.—Apply to SECRETARY.

ST. JAMES'S COLLEGE, SOUTH-LEIGH.—In connexion with the Services of the Village Church. Preparation of GENTLEMEN'S SONS, between the ages of Seven and Fourteen, on sound Church principles for the great Public Schools. Limited to 40 Boys. Prospectus on application; also List of entries at Eton, Winchester, Harrow, &c., on application to the Rev. G. MOUTRIE (Warden) South-Leigh Vicarage, Witney, Oxfordshire. The New Buildings (now occupied) are open to Visitors on any day of the week, except Mondays and Saturdays, between the hours of Two and Three. South-Leigh Station is two hours from Fadington.

STRATFORD-ON-AVON.—TRINITY COLLEGE SCHOOL.
The Warden, RICHARD F. CURRY, M.A., is assisted by Seven Resident Graduate Masters—Two being specially for Modern Languages. Classical and Modern Sides. Junior Department for Young Boys. Large Playgrounds, Five Courts, Gymnasium, &c. &c. Terms 50 and 60 Guineas.—Apply to the WARDEN.

CARSHALTON HOUSE SCHOOL, Surrey.—BOYS carefully prepared for Civil and Military Examinations.

HEATHFIELD, EREIGH (near READING).—Mr. F. FABIAN BRACKENBURY, M.A., educates BOYS from the age of Seven to Twelve.

Mrs. FABIAN BRACKENBURY, a Daughter of the Rev. J. W. Hawtreys, Aldin House, Slough, takes special and personal care of the health and comfort of the Boys.
This Preparatory School is particularly intended to meet cases where parents do not wish to place their Boys under the charge of a Governess at home, or to send their Boys who are too old for the nursery direct to a School where they will mix with Boys much older than themselves.
Heathfield stands high, in six acres of land, on gravelly soil, in a very healthy locality, and is easily accessible from Reading (G.W.R.) and Ereigh (S.W.R.) Stations. The Parish Church is within a few minutes' walk of the School. Special attention is given to Elementary Education. The next School term begins on Tuesday, September 14. Terms £105 per annum.

BOURNEMOUTH.—CHELTENHAM HOUSE (facing the Sea).—J. WILLIAM WILLIAMSON, M.A., Oxford, receives a few BACKWARD or DELICATE BOYS, under Fourteen, for thorough grounding. Terms moderate.

A. M. HEATHCOTE, B.A., Oriel Coll., Oxford, prepares BOYS between Seven and Fourteen for the Public Schools. Vacancies in the Autumn. Terms, £135 or £150.—Address, Woolley Green, near Romsey.

INDIAN and HOME CIVIL T.S., COOPER'S HILL, and the ARMY.—Mr. CROKE is prepared to receive applications for NEXT TERM. There will be a Special Class for the Sept. Sandhurst "Preliminary."—Address, Westbourne Place, Eaton Square, S.W.

LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND.—Reputed for Education and Instruction.—Classical, Industrial Schools about £2 per year. Private Schools, £5 to £15. Homes for Pupils. Boarding Schools for Young Ladies and Boys from £50. English and Presbyterian Churches.—Apply to Bureau de Renseignements, la Grotte, 10, Lausanne.

EDUCATION (SPA, Belgium) for ARMY, NAVY, CIVIL SERVICE, and PUBLIC SCHOOLS.—Thorough French and German. Principals, an English Public Schoolmaster and a Foreign Graduate. Every home comfort. Terms 60 to 80 Guineas.—Address, W. and L. 32A George Street, Hanover Square, W.

TOURS, FRANCE.—Rev. C. DOWMAN, LL.B., receives PUPILS for Woolwich, Sandhurst, Line *et* Militia, and for General Education. Great individual attention. Very successful.—Address, Beau Séjour.

READING at the SEASIDE.—Resident PUPILS prepared for the Oxford or Cambridge Pass Examinations, Matriculation, Army, Civil Service, &c., by a Married OXFORD M.A., formerly Assistant Classical Master in a Public School. List of Pupils and names on application.—Address, Rev. M. A. Cambridge Villa, Norfolk Road, Littlehampton.

WOOLWICH, LINE, and other EXAMINATIONS.—Apply to Mr. ALFRED TUCKER, Salamis, 16 Lee Park, S.E. CLASSES begin on August 2.

DISSATISFIED PARENTS.—An experienced PRIVATE TUTOR desires to receive PUPILS above Fourteen, who require helping on individually, according to parents' wishes.—Address, M.A. Oxon, Stifford's Bridge, Malvern.

HOLIDAY HOME.—THE VICAR of a beautiful and secluded Country Parish, bounded by Malvern Hills, will receive BOYS for special coaching or fresh country air, (other members of the family might also be received.—Address, M.A., care of Messrs. G. Street & Co., 30 Cornhill, E.C.

A LADY wishes to RECOMMEND the SCHOOL where her Two Daughters have finished their education. Sixteen Pupils received, all daughters of gentlemen of position. House large; situation healthy; near London. Educational advantages great. Health and comfort of Pupils considered. Terms from 120 Guineas a year.—For particulars, &c., apply to Mr. HALDANE, Clatto, Cupar Fife, N.B.

HIGH-CLASS SCHOOL for the DAUGHTERS of GENTLEMEN.—Careful home training, with thorough and advanced teaching by well-known London Masters. Resident Foreign Governess. House spacious and detached.—Address, PRINCIPAL, Grafton House, Richmond.

VACATION TUITION, at one of the most beautiful and healthy spots in the scenery of the Wye. An OXFORD M.A., now Reading with a PUPIL for Oxford, can receive one more, or Two Brothers. Cottage on a high hill.—Address, W. H. C. Pen-y-van, Whitebrook, Monmouth.

BAR EXAMINATION and LONDON LL.B.—A BARRISTER (LL.B., B.A., London Honours) receives TWO PUPILS into his Chambers, to prepare for the above Examinations. Past Pupils have obtained Honours both at the 1st and 2nd (LL.B. and Scholarship) at the Inns of Court Examinations. Terms, Six Months, 50 Guineas; Twelve Months, 100 Guineas.—Address, LL.B., 1 St. Stephen's Church Villas, Uxbridge Road.

ARMY CONNEXION for SALE, London. Old established. Average number of Pupils Thirty. Nett income, £2,000. Price moderate. Also a small Army Connexion, Ten Pupils. £300.—Apply to ORELLANA & Co., Army Agency, 32A George Street, Hanover Square, W.

COUNTRY HOUSE, near MALVERN, TO LET, for a short time, FURNISHED. Very roomy; attractive Grounds; Fishing, &c.—Address, J. C. G., Mill Bank, Cradley, Malvern.

ENGLAND to AUSTRALIA in FORTY DAYS.
ORIENT LINE.

The following Royal Mail Steam Ships, belonging to the ORIENT and PACIFIC STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANIES, are despatched every FORTNIGHT for ADELAIDE (Seymour), MELBOURNE, and SYDNEY direct, taking Passengers at through rates to all the principal ports in Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand.

	Tons.	H.P.		Tons.	H.P.
ACONCAGUA	4,107	600	LIGURIA	4,066	750
CHIMBORAZO	3,947	550	LUSITANIA	3,835	550
CUTOPAXI	4,088	600	ORIENT	5,336	1,000
CUZCO	3,945	550	PYTHON	4,219	600
GARONNE	3,875	550	SORATA	4,014	600
JOHN ELDER	4,158	650			

The above Steamers have been specially fitted for carrying all classes of passengers through the Tropics on long voyages, and the passages hitherto made are the fastest on record.
For further particulars apply to the Managers of the Line, F. GREEN & CO., 13 Fenchurch Avenue, and ANDERSON, ANDERSON, & CO., 5 Fenchurch Avenue, London, E.C.

CONSOLS versus GROUND RENTS.—Consols pay 3 per Cent. Freehold Ground Rents are equally safe, pay from 4 to 4½, and constantly increase in value. Descriptive Paper gratis, of Messrs. GEORGE BIKES & CO., Ground Rent Agents, 96 London Wall.

HOTELS.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Facing Sea and Esplanade. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Suites of Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel. BENJN. BULL, Manager.

THE ILFRACOMBE HOTEL is on the Sea Shore. It contains 250 Rooms, and is "a model of sanitary excellence." Table-d'ôte daily. Two Months' Tourist Tickets from all principal Railway Stations in England.—Full information of MANAGER.

TOTLAND BAY, ISLE OF WIGHT, NEAR ALUM BAY.

TOTLAND BAY HOTEL.—Magnificent Sea Views. Comfort with moderate charges. Billiard-room and Tennis-lawn. Braeing all; excellent sands and promenade Pier. Good anchorage for yachts. Apply to Miss FLEMING, Managers, late of the Langham Hotel.

DENTS' WATCHES, CLOCKS, and CHRONOMETERS. Illustrated Catalogue sent free.

Apply to 61 STRAND, or 34 ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE or APARTMENTS THROUGHOUT on MOEDER'S HIRE SYSTEM. The original, best, and most liberal. Cash Prices; no Extra Charge for time given. Large, useful Stock to select from. Illustrated price Catalogue, with Terms, post free.—248, 249, and 250 Tottenham Court Road, and 18, 20, and 21 Morwell Street, W.C. Established 1862.

GOLD MEDAL, PARIS.

"THE fresh and splendid distinction of a Gold Medal, now given in 1878."—Paris Correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*.

FRY'S COCOA EXTRACT.

Guaranteed pure Cocoa only, deprived of the superfluous oil. Sold in Packets and Tins.

WILLS' "THREE CASTLES" TOBACCO.

IN 1-oz., 2-oz., and 4-oz. PACKETS LINED with TINFOIL.

WILLS' "THREE CASTLES" TOBACCO.—"There's no sweeter Tobacco comes from Virginia, and no better brand than the 'THREE CASTLES.'"—Vide "The Virginians." Only in Packets and Cigarettes, protected by the Name and Trade Mark.

WILLS, W. D. & H. O.

ESTABLISHED 1839.

THE PERFECTION OF SCOTCH WHISKEY.—

It is admitted that a thoroughly-matured Scotch Whiskey is the most pleasing and wholesome of stimulants, rivaling the finest of French Brandy.

The *Lancet* says:—"Douglas & Mason's Whiskey is excellent in every respect, smooth in taste and delicate in flavour, the advantage of skilful blending."

Price six pence per dozen, Bottles and Cases included. Delivered free at any Railway Station in England, in quantities of two dozens and upwards.

DOUGLAS & MASON, Wine Merchants, 96 George Street, Edinburgh.

PORTUGAL.

PORTUGUESE LIGHT WINES.

EL REI.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

A Portuguese Light Wine.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Natural White Wine.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

From Portugal.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Without Brandy.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Made from Rhine Vines

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Transplanted into Portugal.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Possesses more character and

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Fulness than other light wines.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Largely consumed in Portugal.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Does not deteriorate when uncorked.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Makes an agreeable and

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Wholesome Summer Drink.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Combines particularly well

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

with all Aerated Waters

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

and makes a delicious cup without

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

the addition of liqueurs.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Maintains its character

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

in all Climates.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Is a cheap Wine.

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Can be obtained from

EL REI.—ROYAL BUCELLAS HOCK.

Wine Merchants and Dealers throughout the Kingdom.

THE LONDON FOOD STORES, LIMITED.

NOMINAL CAPITAL, £50,000.

First Issue of £15,000, in 5,000 Shares of £3 each, bearing a Preferential Interest of 7½ per cent. per annum, and 500 Shares of £10 each (the greater number of which are already subscribed) bearing a Deferred Interest of 10 per cent. per annum.

After payment of the above-named Interest, half the surplus Profits will be divided among the Consumers in proportion to their purchases, and the remaining half will be divided equally between the Preference and Deferred Shareholders.

Directors.

ERNEST BROWNE, Esq., 16 Guilford Street, Russell Square, W.C.

JAMES DOYLE, Esq., 64 Pall Mall, S.W.

Lieut.-Colonel W. W. KNOLLYS (H.-P. 93rd Sutherland Highlanders),

102 Belgrave Road, S.W.

Lord WILLIAM PITT LENNOX, 34 Hans Place, S.W.

J. KINLOCH MALCOLMSON, Esq., 11 King William Street, E.C.

Captain R. BIRD THOMPSON, Walden Hall, Safron Walden.

(With power to add to their number.)

Solicitors—Messrs. BROOKS, JENKINS, & CO., 7 Godliman Street, Doctors' Commons.

Bankers—THE CITY BANK, Threadneedle Street, E.C.

Auditors—Messrs. C. F. KEMP, FORD, & CO., 8 Walbrook, E.C.

Secretary—H. PRICE DAVIES, Esq.

OFFICES AND STORES:

318 OXFORD STREET, W. (formerly the Oxford Circus Skating Rink).

BUSINESS PROGRAMME.

This Association was formed for the purpose of supplying all perishable and other articles of food of the best quality, at the lowest possible prices, by doing away with the profits now earned by middlemen and salesmen.

The Directors were so fortunate as to secure at a low rent perhaps the best adapted premises in London for a market-hall, covering nearly a quarter of an acre, under one immense roof, and situate in the very centre of town.

The Stores were opened in November last, and since that time have done a very satisfactory business. They sell fresh meat, fish, game, and poultry only on their own account, and the Directors have let off stalls in the Hall to good firms for the sale of bacon, ham, cheese, eggs, butter, fruit, flowers, vegetables, canned goods of all sorts, tea, flour, corn, poultry food, Indian condiments, refreshments, singing birds, coals, aerated waters, beer, pianos, ironmongery, bags and trunks, bedsteads, &c. By this means it is expected that the entire rent will shortly be doubled by the sub-rents receivable.

The Directors have now completed arrangements for the regular importation, three times a week, of German fresh meat, sent in refrigerators from Berlin. The first consignment yet sent to this country arrived on May 25, in a perfectly fresh condition; the next consignment was equally good, and others are in course of being forwarded. The opinions of the Press and of several Smithfield Salesmen on this meat are annexed. It sells at as high prices and gives as much satisfaction as the best English meat, although it costs the stores 2d. per lb. less than they have recently been paying in Smithfield for meat of the same quality.

The Stores are now arranging for contracts to supply some of the leading drapery establishments, where from 500 to 2,000 hands are employed, and the Directors believe that this branch of the business alone can be developed to the extent of several thousand pounds sterling per week.

It is proposed to sell this meat wholesale also in Smithfield, when the prices there, as at present, admit of a profit being made. For disposal of the meat on its arrival in London, the Directors have secured the services of Mr. J. D. LINK, of the Metropolitan Meat Market, whose experience of this business is unique, he having been the first to organize the distribution both of American and Australian fresh meat in this country.

The Directors wish to point out that a profit of only a halfpenny per lb. on a turnover of 85, 30 tons a week, would amount to an annual profit of £7,280, nearly six times the amount required to pay the fixed interest on all the capital of this issue, but a much larger quantity than the above could be disposed of without affecting the market. A very large supply of Continental meat is consumed in London, though it is sold by the butchers as English; the number of foreign sheep slaughtered in Deptford alone being nearly 20,000 a week. By importing the meat in a dead state, instead of alive, a very great saving—about 10s. per sheep—is effected.

In order to provide the necessary capital for carrying on this profitable business to advantage the Directors have decided to allot the balance of the first issue of Shares at par. The next issue will not be allotted at a lower premium than 10s. per £2 Share. The Directors have shown their confidence in the undertaking by subscribing for over £2,000 in Shares.

Extracts from letters of Smithfield Salesmen above referred to:—May 29, 1880, from HANNAH WARD & CO.:—"The five-hundred-quarter beef received on Thursday, 27th inst., were perfect in condition and sold readily. We believe this class of meat will always find ready buyers." From HENRY HIGGS & SON:—"The beef arrived in very good condition." From Messrs. BOXSON, WYKES, & WILLIAMS:—"We believe a continued supply of this meat will form an important part of general supply." From P. M. FROST & CO.:—"There will be no difficulty in disposing of any quantity of similar beef."

From the *Morning Post*, June 3:—"In their endeavours to aid in extending the limits within which our supplies of food are drawn, the Directors of the LONDON FOOD STORES, Limited, have done good service to the whole of the metropolis. A part of their programme of reform has been the consignment of meat purchased in the wholesale markets of Germany, and then sent to this country in waggons, with a patent refrigerating apparatus. The arrangements for this method of transport have now been quite completed, and it is estimated that the cattle which have been raised in the eastern parts of Europe can be brought to Berlin, slaughtered there, and delivered in London at a price of 6d. per pound by the whole carcasses. To inaugurate this new branch of their undertaking the Directors on Tuesday invited a number of guests to a luncheon at the Stores, 318 Oxford Street, and a joint of German beef was served, which, although it had been killed exactly a fortnight ago, and had been for eight days removed from the refrigerator, was pronounced to be excellent, both as regards quality and condition."

Prospectuses and Forms of Application for Shares may be obtained of the SECRETARY.

ROSE'S LIME JUICE CORDIAL.
The favourite Summer Beverage.
Cooling and Refreshing.

ROSE'S LIME JUICE CORDIAL.
Prepared from the Lime Fruit.
Is entirely free of Alcohol.

ROSE'S LIME JUICE CORDIAL.
A delicious Drink in Water.
Effervescing in all Aerated Waters.

ROSE'S LIME JUICE CORDIAL.
An excellent Stimulant
blended with Spirits.

ROSE'S LIME JUICE CORDIAL.
Is highly medicinal, Cooling
and purifying the Blood,
assisting Digestion.

ROSE'S LIME JUICE CORDIAL.
Is recommended by the *Lancet*
and Medical Profession as
eminently wholesome.

ROSE'S LIME JUICE CORDIAL.
Sold everywhere by
Wine Merchants, Grocers, Chemists, &c.

ROSE'S LIME JUICE CORDIAL.
Wholesale Stores,
11 Curtain Road, London, and
41 Mitchell Street, Leith.

A P O L L I N A R I S W A T E R.
"Laurea donandus Apollinari."—HORACE, Book IV. Ode 1.

GOLD MEDAL, PARIS, 1879.

ANNUAL SALE, 8,000,000.

APOLLINARIS COMPANY, LIMITED, 19 REGENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

LIFE ASSURANCES, &c.

THE STANDARD LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1825.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1880.

Amount of Assurances accepted	£1,134,444
Ditto, during the last five years	6,306,073
Total Assurances	19,044,745
Revenue	746,459
Invested Funds	5,514,733

DIVISION OF PROFITS, 1880.

THE PROFITS WHICH HAVE ARISEN SINCE 1875 will be divided among Policies in existence at the close of the current year, and Assurances now effected will participate. Since 1855 the Company has distributed THREE MILLIONS Sterling in Bonus additions to Policies.

LONDON—25 KING WILLIAM STREET, E.C., and 3 PALL MALL EAST, S.W.
EDINBURGH—3 AND 5 GEORGE STREET (HEAD OFFICE).
DUBLIN—40 UPPER SACKVILLE STREET.
MANCHESTER—50 SPRING GARDENS. LIVERPOOL—10 COOK STREET.

NORTHERN FIRE AND LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

HEAD OFFICES—ABERDEEN AND LONDON.

Subscribed Capital	£3,000,000
Of which paid up	300,000
Fire Reserve Fund	637,377
Life Funds as per last account	1,463,146

London Board of Directors.

Chairman—Sir WILLIAM MILLER, Bart.

Deputy-Chairman—Right Hon. W. P. ADAM, M.P.

Colonel Robert Baring, Wm. Egerton Hubbard, Jun., Esq.
Ernest Chaplin, Esq. Ferdinand M. Huth, Esq.
Philip Currie, Esq., C.B. Henry James Lubbock, Esq.
George John Fenwick, Esq. John Stewart, Esq.
Alexander H. Goschen, Esq. William Walkinshaw, Esq.

A. P. FLETCHER, General Manager.

PHENIX FIRE OFFICE.

Lombard Street and Charing Cross, London.—ESTABLISHED 1782.

Prompt and liberal Loss Settlements.

Insurances effected in all parts of the World.

JOHN J. BROOMFIELD, Secretary.

IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1803.—1 OLD BROAD STREET, E.C., and 22 PALL MALL, S.W.

CAPITAL, £1,600,000. PAID-UP AND INVESTED, £700,000.

E. COZENS SMITH, General Manager.

THE AGRA BANK, Limited.—ESTABLISHED IN 1833.

CAPITAL, £1,000,000. RESERVE FUND, £175,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS LANE, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

Current Accounts are kept at the Head Office on the Terms customary with London Bankers, and Interest allowed when the Credit Balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:
At 5 per cent. per ann., subject to 12 months' Notice of Withdrawal.

For shorter periods Deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank, free of extra charge; and Approved Bills purchased or sent for collection.

Sales and Purchases effected in British and Foreign Securities, in East India Stock and Loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and Army, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized.

Every other description of Banking Business and Money Agency, British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

LEA & PERRINS' SAUCE.

IN CONSEQUENCE of spurious imitations of LEA & PERRINS' SAUCE, which are calculated to deceive the Public,

LEA & PERRINS have adopted a New Label bearing their Signature, "LEA & PERRINS," which Signature is placed on every Bottle of

WORCESTERSHIRE SAUCE, and without which none is Genuine. Sold Wholesale by the Proprietors, Worcester; Crosse & Blackwell, London; and Export Oilmen generally. Retail, by Dealers in Sauces throughout the World.

DINNEFORD'S MAGNESIA.—This pure Solution is the best remedy for Acidity of the Stomach, Heartburn, Headache, Gout, and Indigestion.

DINNEFORD'S MAGNESIA.—The Safest and most gentle Aperient for Delicate Constitutions, Ladies, Children, and Infants.
OF ALL CHEMISTS.

BOOKS, &c.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY.—NEW and CHOICE

BOOKS.—See page 157 of this day's "Saturday Review."

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY.—CHEAP BOOKS.—See

MUDIE'S CLEARANCE CATALOGUE for AUGUST. This Catalogue contains The Life of the Prince Consort, Vol. III. 5s.; Vol. IV. 6s.; Vol. V. 7s.; Mrs. Brasse's Voyage in the Mediterranean, 9s.; Memoirs of Mrs. Tait, 4s.; Life of Bishop Selwyn, 2 vols. 10s. 6d.; Letters of Charles Dickens, 2 vols. 9s.; Autobiography of Prince Metternich, 2 vols. 9s.; Donna Quixote, 3 vols. 2s.; The Greatest Heroine in England, 3 vols. 2s.; The Story of Barbara, 2 vols. 2s.; The Egmont, 3 vols. 3s. 6d.; and many other Works of the Season at the lowest current prices.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY.—NOTICE.—All the principal

Books in Circulation and on Sale at MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY may also be obtained, with the least possible delay, from MUDIE'S LIBRARY, BARTON ARCADE, MANCHESTER, and (by order) from all Booksellers in connexion with the Library.

Mudie's Select Library, Limited, New Oxford Street. City Office, 2 King Street, Cheapside.

THE UNITED LIBRARIES, 307 Regent Street, W.

Subscriptions from One Guinea to any amount, according to the supply required. All the best New Books, English, French, and German, immediately on publication. Prospectuses, with Lists of New Publications, gratis and post free.

* * * A Clearance Catalogue of Surplus Books offered for Sale at greatly Reduced Prices may also be had free on application.

BOTH'S, CHURTON'S, HODGSON'S, and SAUNDERS & OTLEY'S United Libraries, 307 Regent Street, near the Polytechnic.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW.—The following NUMBERS

of THE SATURDAY REVIEW are required, for which 6d. each will be given, viz.: 74, 75, 76, and 77 (clean copies)—at the Office, 35 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

* Genuine Handbooks, personal experiences of Englishmen abroad.

TOURISTS' PRACTICAL GUIDES.—Passion Play, now

setting at Ammergau, post free, 6d. Included in Practical Continental Guide, 5s.—Practical Swiss Guide, 2s. 6d.—Practical France, Belgium, Holland, Rhine, German Spas, 1s.

London: TRUBNER & Co., 37 Ludgate Hill.

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, No. 311, for JULY

1880, is just published.

CONTENTS:—

1. THE PRECURSORS OF NEWTON.
2. MIND IN THE LOWER ANIMALS.
3. NAVAL POWER IN THE PACIFIC.
4. MEMOIRS OF THE PRINCE CONSORT.
5. SABIAN AND CHRISTIANS OF ST. JOHN.
6. LANDLORDS, TENANTS, AND LABOURERS.
7. MEMOIRS OF MADAME DE RÉMUSAT.
8. HODGKIN'S INVADERS OF ITALY.
9. BRIGHT'S EDITION OF PEPYS' DIARY.
10. THE DIVORCE OF KATHARINE OF ARAGON.
11. THE NEW PARLIAMENT IN SESSION.

London, LONGMANS and Co. Edinburgh, A. and C. BLACK.

FRASER'S MAGAZINE, AUGUST 1880.

No. 608. NEW SERIES CCXVIII. Price 2s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—

- THEEDA: AN ALLEGORY. BY JULIAN HAWTHORNE.
SONNET.
RUSSIA AND CHINA. BY DEMETRIUS C. BOULGER.
BÉRANGER: HIS SONGS AND POLITICS. BY MRS. ELIZA CLARKE.
THE WATER SUPPLY OF LONDON. BY F. R. CONDER.
AN ARTIST ON ART. BY HARRY QUILTER.
THE UP-BRINGING OF PAUPER CHILDREN IN SCOTLAND. BY JOHN SKELTON.
A FORGOTTEN EMPIRE IN ASIA MINOR. BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE.
MARY ANNELEY: A YORKSHIRE TALE. BY E. D. BLACKMORE. CHAPTERS XLIX.—LIII.
THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND POPULAR EDUCATION. BY AN OLD EDUCATIONALIST.
A BATHER'S IDEAL. BY ERNEST MYERS.
PARLIAMENTARY DIFFICULTIES AND POLITICAL PARTIES.
London, LONGMANS & Co.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW, No. CCXCIX, is

just published.

CONTENTS:

1. THE FIRST LORD MINTO.
2. MIDDLESEX.
3. THOMAS CHATTERTON.
4. RECENT AND FUTURE ARCTIC VOYAGES.
5. MARIE ANTOINETTE.
6. THE UNIVERSITIES AND THEIR CRITICS.
7. AROUND THE WORLD WITH GENERAL GRANT.
8. ST. PAUL AND RENAN.
9. WHIGS, RADICALS, AND CONSERVATIVES.

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE for AUGUST 1880.

No. DCCLXXVIII. 2s. 6d.

CONTENTS:

- A REINDEER RIDE THROUGH LAPLAND.
A TALK ABOUT SONNETS.
THE BLACKBIRD. BY W. W. S.
HANS PRELLER: a Legend of the Rhine Falls.
BUSH-LIFE IN QUEENSLAND. Part IV.
CENTRAL ASIA: the Meeting-place of Empires.
IN THE DEER FOREST: a Day Bewitched.
DR. WORTLE'S SCHOOL. Part IV.
IRISH DISTRESS AND ITS ORIGIN.
MINISTERIAL PROGRESS.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, Edinburgh and London.

THE CORNHILL MAGAZINE for AUGUST. With

Illustrations by George Du Maurier and W. Small.

CONTENTS:

- WASHINGTON SQUARE. BY HENRY JAMES, Jun. With an Illustration.
CHAPTERS I.—18.
WHY DID SHAKESPEARE WRITE TRAGEDIES?
ENGLISH SCULPTURE IN 1880.
MINUETS.
THE SWEATING SICKNESS. BY ALEX. CHARLES EWALD.
FOREIGN TITLES.
FAUSTUS AND HELENA: Notes on the Supernatural in Art. BY VERNON LEE.
"THE SHIP OF FOOLS."
THE CARVER AND THE CALIPH. BY AUSTIN DOBSON.
WHITE WINGS: a Yachting Romance. With an Illustration. Chapter 41. Backward Thoughts. Chapter 42. A Toast. Chapter 43. Expectations.
London: SMITH, ELDER, & Co., 15 Waterloo Place.

NOTES ON INDIAN FINANCE. By H. S. CUNNINGHAM,

Judge of the High Court of Bengal, and Member of the Indian Finance Commission.

London: ALLEN & Co., Waterloo Place.

NEW NOVEL BY THE AUTHOR OF "MR. SMITH."

Published this day, 3 vols. post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

TROUBLESOME DAUGHTERS. By L. B. WALFORD, Author

of "Cousins," "Pauline," "Mr. Smith: a Part of his Life," &c.
"The author has a marked talent for the conception of character; she has narrative and descriptive power of a very decided order; she has a healthy mind, and a fair knowledge of the world."—*St. James's Gazette*.

"Is simply fascinating from first to last. . . . It is a pleasure to commend a novel like this with its purity of tone, quiet sense of humour, delicacy of touch, and practical home wisdom. We strongly advise the reader of fiction to turn from the desert of novels abounding at the present hour, to this natural and sparkling book, which ought to be popular everywhere, because full of keen and vivid human interest."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, Edinburgh and London.

1 vol. 7s. 6d.

AN EPITOME OF ANGLICAN CHURCH HISTORY, from

the Earliest Ages to the Present Time. By ELLEN WEBLEY-PARRY.

"The history appears to me to be very valuable. You have evidently given much labour and care to its completion. As far as I have read it, I have found it to be the best of my knowledge accurate and fair. The principles are sound Anglican principles."

Letter to the Author from the Bishop of Winchester.

"A solid and carefully compiled narrative of Anglicanism from the standpoint of the *via media* school, of which the late Dean Hook was the recognized type."—*Bookeller*.

"It is written in an easy and attractive style. We can heartily recommend it."—*National Church*.

"The plan of arrangement is excellent. . . . Its facts are reliable, its authorities and references are clearly stated."—*North Eastern Independent*.

London: GRIFFITH & FARRAN.

Now ready, 1 vol. demy 8vo. with 118 Woodcuts, 15s.

THE PAST IN THE PRESENT: WHAT IS CIVILIZATION?

being the Rhind Lectures in Archaeology, delivered in 1876 and 1878, by ARTHUR MITCHELL, M.D., LL.D., &c., Secretary to the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

Edinburgh: DAVID DOUGLAS.

And all Booksellers.

SPECIMEN LIST OF BOOKS IN GENERAL DEMAND.

HISTORY OF OUR OWN TIMES, by Justin McCarthy.
MEMOIR OF SIR JAMES OUTRAM.
LIFE OF BISHOP WILBERFORCE. Vol. I.
MEMOIR OF REV. HENRY VENN, by Rev. W. Knight.
ELECTION SPEECHES, by the Marquis of Hartington.
THE NEW PARLIAMENT, by William Saunders.
MEMOIRS OF EDWARD AND ADELAIDE STANLEY.
THE WOODS OF SCOTLAND, by J. H. Stoughton.
MEMOIRS OF CATHERINE AND CRAWFORD TAIT.
EARLY YEARS OF CALVIN, by Rev. T. McCrie.
AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF PRINCE METTERNICH.
MEMOIR OF BISHOP MILMAN, by his Sister.
A HISTORY OF GREEK LITERATURE, by J. P. Mahaffy.
EPISODES OF FRENCH HISTORY, by Gustave Masson.
LIFE OF LETTERS, by J. H. Ingram.
HISTOLOGY OF BISHOP WORDSWORTH.
SEGUN'S COUNTRY OF THE PASSION PLAY.
VERN'S GREAT NAVIGATORS OF THE 18TH CENTURY.
AN EASTERN AFTERGLOW, by W. B. Wood.
ESSAYS ON ART AND ARCHEOLOGY, by C. T. Newton.
ALEXANDER POPE, by Leslie Stephen.
SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS, by P. S. Pulling.
LETTERS FROM FRANKLIN, 1789, by Dr. Rigby.
GOD'S BEAUTIFUL, by W. Robinson.
GIPSY LIFE, by George Smith.
SWINBURNE'S SONGS OF THE SPRINGTIDES.
NEW AND OLD VERSES, by J. A. Symonds.
CRITICAL ESSAYS, by Bayard Taylor.
NATURE'S BYEPLAYS, by J. E. Taylor.
FOOD AND FEEDING, by Sir Henry Thompson.
STUDIES IN EUROPEAN HISTORY, by J. E. Taylor.
HOLIDAYS IN HOME COUNTIES, by E. Walford.
THE BOOK OF ESTHER, by Dr. Raleigh.
RENAN'S HIBBERT LECTURES, 1880.
RENOWN'S ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION.
DISCOURSES ON LEADING TRUTHS, by Rev. J. H. Riggs.
EVOLUTION AND INVOLUTION, by G. Thomson.
THE FOUNDATIONS OF FAITH, by Rev. Henry Wace.
SOUNDINGS IN THE SOUTH, by John W. Tucker.
VOYAGES TO THE CORAL, by Ernest Oppert.
THE GREAT FUR LAND, by H. M. Robinson.
ON TRECK IN THE TRANSVAAL, by Harriet A. Roche.
THE HUGENOTS OF THE DISPERSION, by R. L. Poole.
POLITICIANS OF THE DAY, by T. Wemyss Reid.
THE EMPEROR JULIAN, by G. H. Rendall.
PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS, by Sir Gilbert Scott.
LIFE OF SIR JOHN SUTCLIFFE, by John W. Tucker.
SENIOR'S CONVERSATIONS WITH EMINENT MEN.
THE GOVERNMENT OF M. THIERS, by Jules Simon.
LIFE AND TIMES OF BACON, by James Spedding.
A NOOK IN THE APENNINES, by Leader Scott.
MADAGASCAR, by Rev. James Sibree.
OUR HOME IN CYPRUS, by Mrs. Scott-Stevenson.
TRAVELS IN THE CREVENNES, by R. L. Stevenson.
A GARDEN IN THE SOUTH, by J. A. Proctor.
LIFE AND LETTERS OF JANE TAYLOR, by Mrs. Knight.
JOAN OF ARC, by Janet Tucker.
A SHORT HISTORY OF INDIA, by J. T. Wheeler.
MEMOIR OF MARQUESS WELLESLEY, by W. M. Torrens.
GUIENNE: an Autumn Tour, by Algernon Taylor.
THE HAPPY VALLEY: Kashmir, by W. Wakefield.
ROMANIA & BRITISH GUANA, by J. Rodman-Wieland.
MY CHILDREN AND MY NATION, by J. Rodman-Wieland.
HODGE AND HIS FRIENDS, by Richard Jefferies.
LETTERS ABOUT BIRDS, by Rev. F. O. Morris.
THE ODE OF LIFE, by Lewis Morris.
SELECTED CORRESPONDENCE OF MACVEY NAPIER.
THE MUNSTER CIRCUIT, by J. R. O'Flanagan.
JOHN KEATS: a Study, by Frances M. Owen.
THE LECTURES OF A. S. A. by J. H. R. Owen.
DAYS AND NIGHTS IN LONDON, by J. H. Ritchie.
NOTES ON SOME OF TURNER'S DRAWINGS, by J. Ruskin.
RUSKIN'S NOTES ON S. PRUIT AND W. HUST.
RUSSIA AND ENGLAND FROM 1876 TO 1880.
RUSSIA BEFORE & AFTER THE WAR. From the German.
DR. MARTINEAU'S HOURS OF THOUGHT.
PRACTICAL POLITICAL ECONOMY, by Bonamy Price.
LOGIC AND LOGIC, by J. H. R. Price.
SCOTCH SERMONS IN 1880, edited by Prof. Knight.
THE BLACK FOREST, by L. G. Scroggin.

REATA; or, WHAT'S in a NAME.—SUSSEX STORIES.
 REED ROSA; or, REED FARR.—A SON OF MARS.
 THE PURCELL PAPERS.—TROUBLE-SOME DAUGHTERS.
 MISTRESS OF COFFER HALL.—JOAN CARESBROOK.
 IN HER MAJESTY'S KEEPING.—SECOND THOUGHTS.
 WITH A SILKEN THREAD.—THERE'S RUE FOR YOU,
 WOODS AND WINNERS.—THE VIOLIN PLAYER.
 WINGED WORDS.—WAIT A YEAR.—THE TENTH EARL.
 VERY GENTLE.—KIND HEARTS.—LADY LAURA.
 A SYLVAN QUEEN.—THE SEAMY SIDE.—SISTER.
 THE TAPESTRY ROOM.—THREE RECRUITS.
 TWO WOMEN, by Georgiana M. Craik.—SIN JOHN.
 VIVIAN THE BEAUTY.—WYANDOTT WOMAN.
 THE WHITE WILLOW.—WITH A CHAIN.
 YOUNG MRS JARDINE.—WIFE AND PREL.—YOUNG

AND MANY OTHER WORKS OF ACKNOWLEDGED MERIT AND GENERAL INTEREST

SEE MUDIE'S LIBRARY CIRCULAR FOR AUGUST.

Fresh Copies of all the leading BOOKS of the SEASON continue to be added as the demand increases, and arrangements are made with the leading Publishers for an abundant supply of all the Principal Forthcoming Works as they appear.

All the Books in Circulation in MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY may also be obtained by every Subscriber to

MUDIE'S LIBRARY, BARTON ARCADE, MANCHESTER.

And (by Order) from all Booksellers in connexion with the Library.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY, LIMITED, NEW OXFORD STREET, LONDON.

CITY OFFICE: 2 KING STREET. CHEAPSIDE.

Monthly, 1s.

MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE,

No. CCL. (for AUGUST).

CONTENTS:

1. HE THAT WILL NOT WHEN HE MAY. By Mrs. OLIPHANT. Chapters 33-35.
2. ANNIE KEARY. By STANLEY LANE-POOLE.
3. AT SEA. 1880. By Sir FRANCIS H. DOYLE, Bart.
4. JOURNALISTE MALGRÉ LUI.
5. THE IRONCLAD AND GUN OF THE FUTURE. By General W. N. HUTCHINSON.
6. A SPECIAL ASSIZE UNDER LOUIS XIV. By the Rev. HENRY LEACH.
7. TOM TAYLOR. IN MEMORIAM. By THOS. HUGHES.
8. LANDMARKS IN THE NATIONAL GALLERY. By W. C. LEFROY.
9. OATHS. By FREDERICK POLLOCK.

MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON.

Price 2s. 6d.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

For AUGUST 1880.

AN ENGLISHMAN'S PROTEST. By His Eminence CARDINAL MANNING.
PEASANT PROPRIETORS AT HOME. By J. H. TUCK.
FICTION—FAIR AND FOUL. II. By JOHN RUSKIN.
THE CREED OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS. By the Very Rev. the DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.
ICELAND. By Sir DAVID WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P.
REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE COLONIES. By ARTHUR MILLS.
OUR NATIONAL ART COLLECTIONS AND PROVINCIAL ART MUSEUMS. Concluded. By J. C. ROBINSON.
THE FUTURE OF CHINA. By D. C. BOUTLIER.
STATE AID AND CONTROL IN INDUSTRIAL ASSURANCE. By H. SEYMOUR TRIMMER, C.B.
POLITICAL OPTIMISM: a Dialogue. By H. D. TRAILL.
THE LANDOWNERS' PANIC. By JUSTIN MCCARTHY, M.P.
RECENT LITERATURE. Compiled by W. MARK W. CALL, Alfred Church, H. G. HEWLETT, Clements R. MARCHAND, William Minto, James FAYN, G. J. ROMANCE, F. W. RUDLER, Lionel Tennyson, and E. D. J. WILSON.)

C. KEGAN PAUL & CO., LONDON.

Monthly, 2s. 6d.

THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

CONTENTS FOR AUGUST:

A DISHOMED NATION. By the Rev. F. BARHAM ZINCKE.
ON HALF-CULTURE IN GERMANY: Its Causes and Remedies. By Dr. KARL HILDEBRAND.
INTERNATIONAL MORALITY. By the Rev. J. L. DAVIES.
RIVER-WATER, SEA-WATER, AND ROCK-SALT. By JUSTUS ROTH.
MR. HERBERT SPENCER'S DATA OF ETHICS. By the Rev. Professor WACE.
THE MISSING MILLIONS. By Lieut.-Colonel OSBORN.
PROBLEM OF THE HOMERIC POEMS. By Professor JOHN STUART BLACKIE.
RENT: a Reply to Mr. Marrough O'Brien. By Professor BOSAMY PRICE.
COMPARATIVE AESTHETICS. By VERNON LEE.
BELGIUM: the Problem of Liberty in Catholic Countries. By JOHN RAE.
CONTEMPORARY MEN OF LETTERS ON THEIR PREDECESSORS. By GEORGE H. CLARKE.

STRAHAN & CO., LIMITED, 34 PATERNOSTER ROW.

THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW FOR AUGUST.

CONTENTS:

LAND TENURE IN IRELAND. By the Right Hon. Justice LONGFIELD.
WHY THE AMERICAN COLONIES SEPARATED FROM ENGLAND. By J. FISKE.
HEALTH RESORTS IN THE PYRENEES. By Dr. J. BURNEY YEO.
MR. BRADLAUGH AND HIS OPPONENTS. By LESLIE STEPHEN.
FRIENDLY SOCIETIES. By JAMES RANDALL.
SONNET. By ALGERNON CHARLES SWINBURNE.
THE EUROPEAN CONCERT. By D. C. LATHBURY.
THE DECCAN. By Sir DAVID WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P.
PUBLIC OPINION AND ITS LEADERS. By T. WEMYSS REID.
THE POLICY OF COERCION. By W. T. STEAD.
HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

CHAPMAN & HALL, LIMITED, 193 PICCADILLY.

SCRIBNER'S ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE.

Monthly, 1s.

The AUGUST Number (THE MIDSUMMER HOLIDAY SCRIBNER) will contain Twenty-five distinct Articles, and upwards of Sixty high-class Illustrations.

FREDERICK WARNE & CO., Bedford Street, Strand.

SCRIBNER'S ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE.

THE MIDSUMMER HOLIDAY SCRIBNER will be the grandest number of a Shilling Magazine ever published. The custom of making the AUGUST issue of SCRIBNER'S MONTHLY a Special Midsummer Number has now become a recognized feature of the Magazine. 1s.

FREDERICK WARNE & CO., Bedford Street, Strand.

SCRIBNER'S ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE.

CONTENTS FOR AUGUST:

1. OUR RIVER. JOHN BUEBROUGHS.
2. THE WHIP-POOR-WILL. A. M. MACHAR.
3. ABOUT ENGLAND WITH DICKENS. Illustrations by Charles A. Vanderhoof.
4. THE PLAIN STORY OF SAVONAROLA'S LIFE. LINDA VILLARI.
5. WILL THE FRENCH REPUBLIC LAST? JULIET LAMBER.
6. MIDSUMMER. CELIA THAXFEL.
7. THE GRANDISSIMES. X. GEORGE W. CABLE.
8. THE SWEET OF THE YEAR. Words by NELLIE G. CONE. Music by E. C. PHELPS.
9. JIM ALLTHINGS. ALFRED B. STREET.
10. THE WESTERN MAN. CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER.
11. THE DOMINION OF CANADA. GEORGE M. GRANT.
12. PETER THE GREAT. EUGENE SCHUYLER.
13. COR CORDIUM. HORATIO NELSON POWERS.
14. MR. SEYMOUR HADEN'S ETCHINGS. PHILIP GILBERT HAMERTON.
15. AT NIGHT. R. W. G.
16. CURIOSITIES OF ADVERTISING. WILLIAM H. RIDEING.
17. THE BOOK OF MORMON. ELLEN E. DICKINSON.
18. A SKETCH OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY. RICHARD HENRY DANA.
19. MARRYING TITLES. ALBERT RHODES.
20. Topics of the Time—21. Home and Society—22. Culture and Progress—23. Communications—24. World's Work—25. Briefs—26.

FREDERICK WARNE & CO., Bedford Street, Strand.

FISHER LADS' INSTITUTE, Great Grimsby.—See THE BUILDER for View and Plans; also Views of Kingstown Town Hall—Monument to Mercer—and Salford, Germany—Concrete Towers—Tunnel under Mont Blanc—Rebuilding Tay Bridge—Turin Exhibition—Bristol Archaeological—Furniture in Germany—Paris News—Hygienic Museum—Coal Supply, &c. &c. by post, 4d.
46 Catherine Street. And all Newsagents.

WORKS OF GEORGE ELIOT.

CABINET EDITION. 19 vols. £4 15s. Printed from a new and legible type, in a convenient and handsome form.

Each Work sold separately, 5s. a volume. Adam Bede, 2 vols.—The Mill on the Floss, 2 vols.—Silas Marner, The Lifted Veil, Brother Jacob, 1 vol.—Scenes of Clerical Life, 2 vols.—Felix Holt, 2 vols.—Romola, 2 vols.—Middlemarch, 3 vols.—Daniel Deronda, 3 vols.—The Spanish Gypsy, 1 vol.—Jubal, and other Poems, Old and New, 1 vol.

NOVELS of GEORGE ELIOT, each in One Volume. Adam Bede, 2s. 6d.—The Mill on the Floss, 3s. 6d.—Silas Marner, 2s. 6d.—Scenes of Clerical Life, 3s.—Felix Holt, 3s. 6d.—Romola, 3s. 6d.—Middlemarch, 7s. 6d.—Daniel Deronda, 7s. 6d.

IMPRESSIONS of THEOPHRASTUS SUCH. By GEORGE ELIOT. Fourth Edition, 10s. 6d.

WISE, WITTY, and TENDER SAYINGS, from the WORKS of GEORGE ELIOT. Selected by ALEXANDER MAIR. Fourth and enlarged Edition, containing Extracts from "Daniel Deronda" and "Theophrastus Such," fcp. gilt cloth, 6s.

THE GEORGE ELIOT BIRTH-DAY BOOK. Fcp. handsomely bound in cloth gilt, 3s. 6d.; leather, 5s.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH AND LONDON.

Published this day, large 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER.

Books I.—XII.

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH VERSE, WITH NOTES AND PARALLEL PASSAGES.

By Sir CHARLES DU CANE, K.C.M.G.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH AND LONDON.

SMITH, ELDER, & CO.'S NEW BOOKS.

NEW WORK BY THE AUTHOR OF "THE GAMEKEEPER AT HOME."

ROUND ABOUT A GREAT ESTATE.

By RICHARD JEFFERIES, Author of "The Gamekeeper at Home," "Wild Life in a Southern County," "The Amateur Poacher," "Greene Ferne Farm," "Hodge and His Masters." Crown 8vo, 5s. [Early in August.]

Just published, 2 vols. demy 8vo. with Illustrations and Maps, 32s.

LIFE of Lieut.-Gen. Sir JAMES OUTRAM.

By Major-General Sir FREDERIC J. GOLDSMID, C.B., K.C.S.I.

NEW VOLUME BY ROBERT BROWNING.

DRAMATIC IDYLS. Second Series. By ROBERT BROWNING. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

RENAISSANCE in ITALY: Age of the Despots. By JOHN ADDINGTON SYMONDS, M.A. Second Edition, demy 8vo. price 16s.

LONDON: SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15 WATERLOO PLACE.

GEORGE BELL & SONS' BOOKS.

THE CONDITION of NATIONS, Social and Political.

With complete Comparative Tables of Universal Statistics. By Baron KOLB. Translated, Edited, and Collated to 1880, by Mrs. BREWSTER. With Original Notes and Information by EDWIN W. STREETER, F.R.G.S., Gold Medalist of the Royal Order of Frederic, Author of "Precious Stones," "Gold," &c. Royal 8vo. 98s pp. 42s.

HISTORY of POLITICAL ECONOMY in EUROPE.

By JÉRÔME-ADOLPHE BLANQUI, Successor to J. B. Say in the Chair of Political Economy in the Conservatory of Arts and Trade (Collège de France). Translated from the Fourth French Edition by EMILY J. LEONARD, with Preface by DAVID A. WELLS. Medium 8vo. 12s.

LECTURES and LESSONS on ART; being an Introduction to a Practical and Comprehensive Scheme.

By F. W. MOODY, Instructor in Decorative Art at South Kensington Museum. With Diagrams to illustrate Composition and other matters. Third Edition, revised, demy 8vo. 4s. 6d.

THE GOLDEN HIND: a Tale of the Invincible Armada

(the scene chiefly laid at Studland, Poole, and on the Dorset Coast); THESSALE; and other Poems. By C. E. ROBINSON, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Author of "The Cruise of the Widgeon." Fcp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

4 YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

Fcp. 8vo. cloth, 4s. 6d.; morocco, 9s. Pocket size, cloth, 3s.; morocco, 6s.

THE FLY ROUND: Meditation, Prayer, and Praise

Adapted to the Course of the Christian Year. Containing a Text, a Meditation, a Devotion, and a Verse for every day in the year.

LONDON: J. WHITAKER, 12 WARWICK LANE.

At all Libraries and Railway Bookstalls, 1 vol. crown 8vo. post free, 10s. 6d.

THE STORY of STELLA PEEL. By HARRIET L. CHILDE.

PERMUTATIONS—THE LITERARY PRODUCTION COMMITTEE, 40 Southampton Buildings, W.C. P.O. Order to C. M. CLARKE, payable at Chief Office.

Demy 8vo. with Maps and Illustrations, cloth, 16s.

PORTUGAL, OLD AND NEW.By OSWALD CRAWFURD,
H.M.'s Consul at Oporto.

"It is quite possible that there may be other English residents who know Portugal and the Portuguese as well as Mr. Crawford, but it is certain that no Englishman has written more interesting books on the country."—*Saturday Review*.

"Mr. Crawford's admirable book is most opportune, and his long residence in the country, his intimate and critical knowledge of the language, history, poetry, and the inner life of the people, render him an authority as safe to follow as he is pleasant. . . . The book is excellent in every way."—*Athenaeum*.

"Than this a more agreeable account of Portugal and the Portuguese could scarcely have been written, and it will surprise us if the book does not live as one of the best descriptions we possess of a foreign nation."—*St. James's Gazette*.

"The reader acquires a distinct and vivid impression of the matters that are chosen to be worked out; and as they include political and domestic economy, history, literature, antiquities, geography, agriculture, sport, and most important of all, port wine, there is diversity enough to suit every taste. Mr. Crawford, however, though he has a lively sense of fun and a considerable faculty of writing wittily, does not allow these gifts to gain the mastery over him."—*Fall Mail Gazette*.

C. KEGAN PAUL & CO., 1 PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

THIS DAY.

LORD HARTINGTON'S SPEECHES.

ELECTION SPEECHES in 1879 and 1880;
with Address to the Electors of North-East Lancashire. By the Right Hon. the Marquis of HARTINGTON, M.P. Crown 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

With Maps, small crown 8vo. 5s.

A SKETCH of the KAFIR and ZULU WARS:
Gwadana to Isandhlwana. By Captain HENRY HALLAM PARR, Military Secretary to H.E. Sir Bartle Frere.

Small crown 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

CORYDALIS: a Story of the Sicilian Expedition. By EDWARD M. HAWTREY.

Crown 8vo. cloth, 6s.

PALACE AND PRISON and FAIR GERALDINE: Two Tragedies. By the Author of "Ginevra" and the "Duke of Guise."

Crown 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

ANIMAL MAGNETISM: Physiological Observations. By RUDOLF HEIDENHAIN, M.D., Professor of Physiology in the University of Breslau. Translated from the Fourth German Edition by L. C. WOOLDRIDGE, with a Preface by G. R. ROMANES, F.R.S.

LONDON: C. KEGAN PAUL & CO., 1 PATERNOSTER SQUARE.

WM. H. ALLEN & CO.'S NEW PUBLICATIONS.

CHUSHINGURA; or, the Loyal League: a Japanese Romance.
Translated by FREDERICK V. DICKINS, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. With Naniwa and an Appendix. Crown 8vo. Illustrated by numerous Engravings on Wood, drawn and executed by Japanese Artists, and printed on Japanese paper, 10s. 6d.

"The narrative has a curious vigour, healthiness, and freshness. The woodcuts are excellent. Mr. Dickinson's admirable appendix contains many interesting notes on Japanese folk-lore, customs, and religion."—*Saturday Review*.

INDIAN INDUSTRIES. By A. G. F. ELIOT JAMES, Author of "A Guide to Indian Household Management," &c. Crown 8vo. 2s.

CONTENTS: Indian Agriculture—Beer—Cacao—Carpets—Chemicals—Cinchona—Coffee—Cotton—Drugs—Dyeing and Colouring Materials—Fibrous Substances—Forestry—Hides—Skins and Horns—Gums and Resins—Irrigation—Ivory—Mining—Oils—Opium—Paper—Pottery—Ryots—Seeds—Silk—Spices—Sugar—Tea—Tobacco—Wood—Wool—Table of Exports—Index.

"The main purpose of this volume is to show how vast are the natural resources of India, and how much of the mineral, animal, and vegetable wealth of the country is still undeveloped. . . . The whole work gives evidence of painstaking, and the writer's personal knowledge of India comes in with considerable effect."—*St. James's Gazette*.

THE GARDEN of INDIA; or, Chapters on Oudh History and Affairs. By H. C. IRWIN, B.A. Oxon., Bengal Civil Service. 8vo. 12s.

"Mr. Irwin has produced a very comprehensive account of the province whose welfare he has at heart. He has spared no pains in collecting useful facts and statistics, and gives a full and interesting account of the country and its inhabitants, their diversions and occupations, and the present state of agriculture, &c."—*Manchester Examiner*.

PICKED UP in the STREETS; or, Struggles for Life amongst the London Poor. By RICHARD ROWE, "Good Words" Commissioner, Author of "Jack Abbot and Ashore," "Episodes in an Obscure Life," &c. Crown 8vo. with Illustrations, 6s.

"Few men have gone about such a work in a less sensational and more conscientious manner. The result is a series of sketches of much ability and of great graphic power. . . . The volume is full of interest."—*Scotsman*.

TWENTY-ONE DAYS in INDIA; being the Tour of Sir Ali Baba, K.C.B. By GEORGE ABERNETHY-MACKAY. Post 8vo. 4s.

"Mr. Mackay's humour and satire possess a rare charm, and he indulges in a wealth of literary allusions which all readers of culture will appreciate."—*Academy*.

INDIAN REMINISCENCES. By Colonel S. DEWE WHITE, late Bengal Staff Corps. 8vo. with 10 Photographs, 14s.

"Gives a capital idea of what sort of a land India really is. . . . A narrative of a most eventful life, interwoven in the description of India, and a running history of the Indian mutiny, which forms part of the author's reminiscences, will, doubtless, be esteemed. Altogether the work is one of very exceptional interest."—*Daily Telegraph*.

THE CHALLENGE of BARLETTA. By MASSIMO D'AZEGLIO. Rendered into English by Lady LOUISA MAGENIS. 2 vols. 21s.

"Lady Louisa Magenis has produced a careful and sympathetic translation of D'Azeglio's novel, one of the best examples of Italian historical fiction. It furnishes an elaborate picture of the manners and customs of the period. The fictional and historical elements are so skilfully interwoven as fully to sustain the interest of the story."—*Scotsman*.

SIGNOR MONALDINI'S NIECE: a Novel of Italian Life. 1 vol. post 8vo. 6s.

"The niece of Signor Monaldini is one of the most interesting and most charming young ladies who of late years has made her appearance in fiction; the adventures she goes through are of the most exciting kind."—*Fall Mail Gazette*.

LONDON: WM. H. ALLEN & CO., 13 WATERLOO PLACE.

**SAMPSON LOW, MARSTON, & CO.'S
NEW LIST.**

FOREIGN COUNTRIES and BRITISH COLONIES. Edited by F. S. PULLING, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford, and formerly Professor at the Yorkshire College, Leeds.

Under the above title it is proposed to publish a series of small volumes descriptive of the principal Countries of the World, each Country being treated of by a Writer who from personal knowledge is qualified to speak with authority on the subject.

The general aim of the Series will be to present a clear and accurate idea of the actual state of the different Countries in a sufficiently popular form to prove interesting to the general reader, while at the same time it is intended that the Works should be useful for Educational Purposes.

The Volumes will average 180 crown 8vo. pages, and will contain Maps and a few typical Illustrations. The price of the Volumes will be 3s. 6d. each.

The following Volumes are ready or in preparation:

DENMARK and ICELAND.
GREECE.
SWITZERLAND.
AUSTRIA.
RUSSIA.
PERSIA.
JAPAN.
PERU.
CANADA.

[Ready.]

SWEDEN and NORWAY.
THE WEST INDIES.
NEW ZEALAND.
FRANCE.
EGYPT.
SPAIN.
TURKEY-IN-ASIA.
AUSTRALIA.
HOLLAND.

[Ready.]

THE WEST INDIES. By CHARLES H. EDEY, F.R.G.S., Author of "Frozen Asia," "The Fifth Continent," &c. Crown 8vo. with Map and Illustrations, 230 pp. 3s. 6d. [Now ready.]

GREECE. By LEWIS SERGEANT. With Illustrations and Physical and Political Maps, showing proposed Boundary. Crown 8vo. 191 pp. 3s. 6d. [Now ready.]

THE NEW VOLUMES in THE ILLUSTRATED BIOGRAPHIES OF THE GREAT ARTISTS ARE:

SIR EDWIN LANDSEER. By F. G. STEPHENS, Author of "Celebrated Flemish and French Pictures," &c. Illustrated with 16 Facsimiles of Etchings, including "The Greyhound," "The Rabbit Warren," the 3 Plates of "The Mothers," and the 13 small Etchings of the "Woburn Game-card." Bound in cloth, price 3s. 6d.

SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS. By F. S. PULLING, M.A. Oxford. Illustrated with Reproductions of 16 of his most celebrated Paintings, including "The Duchess of Devonshire," "Penelope Boothby," "Age of Innocence," "The Strawberry Girl," "Mrs. Siddons," &c. Bound in cloth, 3s. 6d. [Now ready.]

GIOTTO. By HARRY QUILTER, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. Illustrated with Photographs of the Frescoes in the Cappella d'Arena, Padua; a Facsimile in Colour of a Madonna in the Lower Church of Assisi; and Engravings from the Bas-reliefs of the Giotto Campanile at Florence. Small 4to. handsomely bound in cloth, with gilt top, 15s. [Now ready.]

ILLUSTRATED TEXT-BOOKS OF ART EDUCATION. Edited by EDWARD J. FORD, Esq. Each volume contains numerous Illustrations, and is strongly bound for the use of Students. 5s.

The Volumes now ready are:

PAINTING.

CLASSIC and ITALIAN. By EDWARD J. POYNTER, R.A.; and PERCY R. HEAD, Lincoln College, Oxford. Upwards of 80 full-page and other Illustrations, bound in extra cloth limp. 5s.

"This Volume contains an introductory Preface on Art Education by Mr. Poynter, who also contributes a Chapter on Egyptian Art, and succinct notices of the various Italian Schools, &c."

ARCHITECTURE.

GOTHIC and RENAISSANCE. By T. ROGER SMITH, F.R.I.B.A. With 120 Illustrations, cloth limp. 5s.

"This Volume treats of the history of Architecture from the rise of the Gothic style to the general depression which overtook the Renaissance style at the close of the eighteenth century."

LONDON: SAMPSON LOW, MARSTON, SEARLE, & RIVINGTON, CROWN BUILDINGS, 188 FLEET STREET, E.C.

13 GREAT MARLBOROUGH STREET.

HURST & BLACKETT'S NEW WORKS.

MONSIEUR GUIZOT in PRIVATE LIFE, 1787-1871. By his Daughter, Madame DE WITT. Translated by Mrs. SIMPSON. 1 vol. 8vo. 15s.

TALES of OUR GREAT FAMILIES. SECOND SERIES. By EDWARD WALFORD, M.A. 2 vols. 21s.

THE VILLAGE of PALACES; or, Chronicles of Chelsea. By the Rev. A. G. L'ESTRANGE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 21s.

NEW AND POPULAR NOVELS.

THE TENTH EARL. By JOHN BERWICK HARWOOD, Author of "Lady Flavia," &c. 3 vols.

FORESTALLED. By M. BETHAM-EDWARDS, Author of "Kitty," "Holidays in Eastern France," &c. 2 vols.

"Forestalled" is a very remarkable novel.—*Sunday Times*.

WOOLERS and WINNERS. By Mrs. G. LINNEUS BANKS, Author of "The Manchester Man," &c. 3 vols.

"A thoroughly readable, fresh, and wholesome novel."—*John Bull*.

A MODERN GREEK HEROINE. 3 vols.

"The author may be congratulated on a very attractive and clever story."—*Athenaeum*.

MERVYN O'CONNOR. By the Earl of DESART, Author of "Kilverdale," &c. 3 vols.

"A bright, lively story, full of interest and action."—*Sunday Times*.

MISS BOUVERIE. By Mrs. MOLESWORTH, Author of "Hathercourt Rectory," "The Cuckoo Clock," &c. 3 vols.

A VERY OPAL. By C. L. PIRKIS, Author of "In a World of his Own," &c. 3 vols. [Next week.]

Now ready, demy 8vo. 230 pp. 5s.

SLIGHT AILMENTS: their Nature and Treatment. By LIONEL S. BEALE, F.R.S., Professor of Medicine in King's College, London.

J. & A. CHURCHILL.

BOOKS FOR COUNTRY AND SEASIDE READING.

BENTLEY'S FAVOURITE NOVELS.

Each Work can be had separately, price 6s. of all Booksellers in Town or Country.

By Mrs. HENRY WOOD.

East Lynne. (95th Thousand.)
The Channings. (35th Thousand.)
Mrs. Halliburton's Troubles.
The Master of Greylands.
Verner's Pride.
Within the Maze.
Lady Adelaide.
Bessy Rane.
Roland Yorke.
Lord Oakburn's Daughters.
Shadow of Ashlydyat.
Oswald Cray.
Dene Hollow.
George Canterbury's Will.
Trevelyn Hold.
Mildred Arkell.
St. Martin's Eve.
Elster's Folly.
Anne Hereford.
A Life's Secret.
Red Court Farm.
Orville College.
Parkwater.
Edina.
Pomeroy Abbey.

By ANTHONY TROLLOPE.

The Three Clerks.

By ANONYMOUS AUTHORS.

Probation.
The First Violin.
Johnny Ludlow.

By Miss AUSTEN.

(The only complete Edition.)

Sense and Sensibility.
Emma.
Pride and Prejudice.
Mansfield Park.
Northanger Abbey and Persuasion.
Lady Susan and The Watsons.

By HELEN MATHERS.

Comin' thro' the Rye.
Cherry Ripe!

By Baroness TAUTPHÆUS.

The Initials.
Quits.
Cyrilla.

By Lady G. FULLERTON.

Constance Sherwood.
Too Strange not to be True.
Ladybird.

By Miss CAREY.

Nellie's Memories.

By RHODA BROUGHTON.

Joan.
Nancy.
Good-bye, Sweetheart!
Red as a Rose is She.
Cometh up as a Flower.
Not Wisely but too Well.

By Mrs. ALEXANDER.

The Heritage of Langdale.
Her Dearest Foe.
The Wooing O't.
Which shall it be?

By Mrs. ANNIE EDWARDES.

Leah: a Woman of Fashion.
Ought we to Visit her?
Susan Fielding.
Steven Lawrence: Yeoman.

By HAWLEY SMART.

Breezie Langton.

By Mrs. NOTLEY.

Olive Varcoe.

By MARCUS CLARKE.

For the Term of his Natural Life.

BENTLEY'S FOREIGN FAVOURITE NOVELS.

By Mrs. AUGUSTUS CRAVEN.

A Sister's Story.

By E. WERNER.

Success: and How he Won it. | Under a Charm.

NEW WORKS JUST READY.

THE TEMPLE BAR MAGAZINE,

No. CCXXXVII. for AUGUST 1880, at all Booksellers', 1s.

"One can never help enjoying 'Temple Bar.'"—*Guardian*.

THOUGHTS in MY GARDEN. By the late

MORTIMER COLLINS. Edited by EDMUND YATES. With Notes by the Editor and Mrs. MORTIMER COLLINS. 2 vols. crown 8vo.

A TRIP to MANITOBA. By MARY FITZ-

GIBSON. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

FIVE WEEKS in ICELAND. By Miss

DE FONBLANQUE. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

NIGH UNTO THE END; or, a Passage in

Sacred Prophecy now in course of Translation into History, considered. By the Rev. J. C. BOYCE, M.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

"Already the Eastern sky is aglow with the reddening rays of its advent glory, and, by all the signs of which Himself hath spoken, the Master cometh."
From a Charge by the late Bishop of Winchester.

POPULAR NOVELS AT ALL LIBRARIES.

MISS BROUGHTON'S NEW NOVEL.

SECOND THOUGHTS. By RHODA BROUGHTON,

Author of "Cometh Up as a Flower," "Joan," &c. 2 vols. crown 8vo.

NEW NOVEL BY THE AUTHOR OF "CUT ADRIPT."

PIOUS FRAUDS. By ALBANY DE FONBLANQUE,

Author of "Cut Adrift," "A Tangled Skein," &c. 3 vols. crown 8vo.

MISS THOMAS'S NEW NOVEL.

THE VIOLIN PLAYER. By BERTHA THOMAS.

3 vols. crown 8vo.

"Miss Thomas's new novel is a success. She has chosen a satisfactory theme and produced a well-constructed story. In studies of character her book is unusually rich, and she understands the artistic temperament thoroughly. It is clear that she possesses the gift of novel-writing."—*Athenæum*.

LADY M. MAJENDIE'S NEW NOVEL.

FASCINATION. By Lady M. MAJENDIE.

2 vols. crown 8vo.

SOME STANDARD WORKS.

THE INGOLDSBY LEGENDS; or, Mirth

and Marvels. By Rev. RICHARD HARRIS BARHAM. The Annotated Edition. 2 vols. demy 8vo. Illustrated by Cruikshank and Leech, 24s. The Illustrated Edition, printed on toned paper, crown 4to, bevelled boards, gilt edges, 21s.; or in white binding, 22s. 6d. The Carmine Edition, with border line round each page, with 17 Illustrations, bevelled boards, gilt edges, 10s. 6d. The Burlington Edition, 3 vols. fcp. 8vo. 10s. 6d. The Edinburgh Edition, crown 8vo. with 32 Engravings by Cruikshank, Leech, Tenniel, and Du Maurier, cloth, 6s. The (New) Popular Edition, crown 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d. The Victoria (Pocket) Edition, fcp. 8vo. cloth, 2s.

THE HEAVENS: an Illustrated Handbook

of Popular Astronomy. By AMÉDÉE GUILLEMIN. Edited by J. NORMAN LOCKYER, F.R.A.S. Revised Edition, demy 8vo. with over 290 Illustrations, price 12s.

CURIOSITIES of NATURAL HISTORY.

By FRANK BUCKLAND. Popular Edition, 4 vols. crown 8vo. with Illustrations, 14s. Each volume can be had separately, 3s. 6d.

THE FIFTEEN DECISIVE BATTLES of

the WORLD, from Marathon to Waterloo. By Sir EDWARD CREASY, late Chief Justice of Ceylon. Library Edition, demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. Popular Edition, the Twenty-seventh, crown 8vo. 6s.

THE LIFE of OLIVER CROMWELL.

From the French of M. GUIZOT, by ANDREW SCOBLE. Crown 8vo. with 4 Portraits, 6s.

THE LIFE of MARY, QUEEN of SCOTS.

From the French of M. MIGNET, by ANDREW SCOBLE. Crown 8vo. with 2 Portraits, 6s.

THE LIVES of WITS and HUMOURISTS.

By JOHN TIMBS, F.S.A. 2 vols. crown 8vo. with Portraits, 12s. The LIVES of the LATER WITS and HUMOURISTS, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s.

THE LIVES of PAINTERS. By JOHN TIMBS,

F.S.A., Author of "A Century of Anecdote," &c. Crown 8vo. with Portraits, price 6s.

THE LIVES of STATESMEN: Burke and

Chatham. By JOHN TIMBS, F.S.A. Crown 8vo. with Portraits, 6s.

RICHARD BENTLEY & SON, NEW BURLINGTON STREET,
PUBLISHERS IN ORDINARY TO HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

Printed by SPOTTISWOODE & CO., at No. 5 New-street Square, in the Parish of St. Bride, in the City of London; and Published by DAVID JONES, at the Office, No. 33 Southampton Street, Strand, in the Parish of St. Paul, Covent Garden, in the County of Middlesex.—Saturday, July 31, 1880.